

# **Canadianness is Wilderness? Violent Love Relationships with ‘Wild’ Bodies**

Amanda Marynowycz, Master of Arts

Critical Sociology

Submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Critical Sociology

Faculty of Sociology, Brock University  
St. Catharines, Ontario

© 2014



## **Dedication**

*For all the colonized individuals (humans and non-human animals) who continue to suffer violence and abuse as a result of unchecked White and human privileges.*

## **Abstract**

This thesis reveals contradictions that Canadians experience with groups attached to western construction of wilderness namely Indigenous people and wildlife. My study analyzes how the discourse of Canadian wilderness identity is played out in Algonquin Provincial Park and Bruce Peninsula National Park in comparison to non-nature/urban spaces (Greater Toronto Area). My investigation employs a critical discourse analysis and participant observation. I undertake three main tasks: 1) I describe how violent love is a dominant discourse at the Parks, 2) I examine evidence of animals and Indigenous people being produced relationally in the Parks, and 3) I analyze how relationships are spatially organized. My research reveals that the Parks conceal practices of violence that are central to the intersections of speciesism and colonialism. I demonstrate how violent love operates across a continuum that is influenced by spatial belonging and distance. This research is a contribution to the production of non-speciesist knowledge.

**Key Words:** Violence, Colonialism, Contradictions, Wilderness, and Wildlife.

## **Acknowledgments**

My most grateful appreciation goes to Professor John Sorenson for your expertise in critical animal studies and for your constant encouragement throughout all stages. Thank you sincerely for your endless patience that allowed me to develop my ideas into the project that was created. I appreciate your constructive feedback and challenging questions that profoundly contributed to the finished product of this research. Finally thank you for creating a supportive role to me that aided in my ability to think freely. Professor Hijin Park, thank you for challenging me in SOCI 5P60 to radically rethink my White privilege. This course was the beginning of this research project that I could never have imagined when I began the MACS program. Thank you for the vital resources in the beginning stages of this thesis that provided important foundational knowledge for this research and for all of your insightful suggestions throughout this process. Thanks to Professor Keri Cronin for your thoughtful feedback throughout this process and for your knowledge and expertise in related areas of research. Julia Gottli, thank you kindly for always promptly answering any of my questions and helping me in all ways possible.

A huge heartfelt thanks to my fiancé, Agostino Monteleone for your continuous support, guidance, and advice throughout this research process and my academic career. Thank you for staying up late to help me and always listen to me, your encouragement throughout this process will never be forgotten. Additionally, thank you for keeping me company when visiting Bruce Peninsula for this research and for always challenging me to produce the best work possible. Scott Marynowycz (my brother), thank you for always listening to me read you many sections of this thesis and for your feedback, you were an important critic. Also, I appreciate you coming with me to Algonquin to collect important data for this research. Thank you to my parents Lori and John Marynowycz, who supported my dreams to pursue this Masters Degree. Many thanks to my furry friend, Cooper who provided endless hours of companionship throughout this

research investigation. Finally, thank you to all my peers in the MACS program that offered support and friendship, and to the many other faculty members at Brock University that influenced me and this research. Thank you to all of you, for I am truly grateful.

## Table of Contents

<b>Dedication</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Research Questions</i>	5
<i>Personal Positionality</i>	10
<b>Chapter One: Literature Review</b>	<b>15</b>
<i>Nationalism, Environmentalism and Nature</i>	15
<i>Speciesism and Social Construction of Animals</i>	21
<i>Indigeneity and Race Studies</i>	26
<i>Space and Attitudes towards Predator Animals</i>	31
<i>Research Gaps and Chapter Summary</i>	35
<b>Chapter Two: Methodology</b>	<b>38</b>
<i>Qualitative Research</i>	38
<i>Sources of Data and Methods of Data Analysis</i>	39
<i>Participant Observation</i>	41
<i>Critical Discourse Analysis</i>	43
<i>Sampling</i>	45
<i>Variables and Themes</i>	50
<i>Chapter Summary</i>	53
<b>Chapter Three: Theoretical Framework</b>	<b>54</b>
<i>Discussion</i>	54
<i>Spatial Theory</i>	55
<i>Animal Geography</i>	57
<i>Strengths and Limitations</i>	59
<i>Violent Love</i>	59
<i>Chapter Summary</i>	60
<b>PART ONE</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Chapter Four: The ‘Wilderness’ Experience: <i>Invisibility of Exploitation</i></b>	<b>62</b>
<i>Mythical Dualisms of Space and Spatial Conflicts of Parks Use</i>	62
<i>Contradictions inside the Nature Parks</i>	65
<i>Logging in Nature Parks</i>	65

<i>Hunting/Trapping Wildlife in ‘Protected’ Spaces and Invisible Boundaries</i>	67
<i>Fishing and Speciesism</i>	70
<i>Contradictions of Meat eating and ‘Going up North’</i>	75
<i>Wilderness/Nature Tourism and Wildlife/Environmental Preservation</i>	81
<i>Capitalism and Master Narrative of Nature Parks</i>	92
<b>PART TWO</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Chapter Five: The ‘Wilderness’ Experience: Commodification and Colonial Spaces</b>	<b>100</b>
<i>Park Representation and the Gift Shop Experience</i>	100
<i>Bears are ‘Comedians’</i>	103
<i>Wolves as ‘Wilderness’</i>	109
<i>The Moose and Canadianness is Wilderness</i>	114
<i>Indigeneity: A Spectacle of Consumption and Commodification</i>	119
<i>Relational Theme of Manufacturing Wilderness Fantasies and Violent Love of Moccasins</i>	127
<i>Visitor Center Museums: Progress, Post-colonialism and Taxidermy</i>	141
<i>Painting the Nation</i>	142
<i>Visitor Centers: a Colonial Space</i>	145
<i>Taxidermy Representation and Colonialism</i>	147
<i>Animality and Indigeneity</i>	154
<i>Part One and Part Two: The Wilderness Experience Chapter Summary</i>	159
<b>Chapter Six: Urban Wildlife and Indigenous Resistance and Oppression outside Fantasy Spaces</b>	<b>165</b>
<i>Urban ‘Invaders’: Human-Wildlife Conflicts</i>	166
<i>Urban Coyotes</i>	169
<i>Invisibility of the Visible Issues Indigenous Populations Experience in Non-Park Spaces</i>	186
<i>Chapter Summary</i>	196
<b>Chapter Seven &amp; Final Discussion: Socio-Spatial Exclusion and Invisible Boundaries that Govern Unruly Bodies</b>	<b>202</b>
<i>Chapter Summary</i>	211
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>213</b>
<i>Summary of Findings</i>	215
<i>Key Findings from Research</i>	221
<i>Final Thoughts</i>	222
<b>Limitations and Pathways for Further Research</b>	<b>226</b>
<i>Limitations</i>	226
<i>Possibilities for Further Research</i>	229
<b>References</b>	<b>234</b>
<b>Photograph Appendix: Algonquin Provincial Park and Bruce Peninsula National Park</b>	<b>247</b>



## List of Figures

### Chapter Four

Figure 1: Beef Jerky Food Snack (Algonquin: Portage Shop)	75
Figure 2: Camp Fork (Algonquin: Portage Shop)	75
Figure 3: Canadianness and Bacon (Algonquin: Restaurant on Canoe Lake)	76
Figure 4: Canoe Experience (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	90, 119
Figure 5: ‘Wilderness’ Pepsi Machine (Algonquin: Logging Museum)	94
Figure 6: Loggers Progress (Algonquin: Logging Museum)	97

### Chapter Five

Figure 7: Cartoon Black Bear Welcome Sign (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	105
Figure 8: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	105
Figure 9: Waving Bear (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	105
Figure 10: Dancing Bear (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	105
Figure 11: Angel Bear (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	105
Figure 12: Bears Wearing Clothing (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	105
Figure 13: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	105
Figure 14: Wilderness Ornament Bear (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	105
Figure 15: Bears Canoeing (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	105
Figure 16: Algonquin: Gift Shop	105
Figure 17: Bear and Moose Canoeing (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	105
Figure 18: Algonquin: Gift Shop	105
Figure 19: Canada Bear (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	105
Figure 20: Don’t Feed the Bears (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	105
Figure 21: Real Bear Magnets (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	106
Figure 22: Real Bear Postcard (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	106
Figure 23: Bear Head Skin (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	106
Figure 24: Canadian Fast Food (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	106, 107
Figure 25: Avoiding Bear Attacks (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	106
Figure 26: Humans Taste Like Chicken (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	106, 107
Figure 27: Wolves as ‘Wilderness’ (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	110
Figure 28: Algonquin: Gift Shop	110
Figure 29: Algonquin: Gift Shop	110
Figure 30: Algonquin: Gift Shop	110
Figure 31: Algonquin: Gift Shop	110
Figure 32: Algonquin: Gift Shop	110
Figure 33: Algonquin: Gift Shop	110
Figure 34: Solo Wolf in the Woods (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	110
Figure 35: Celebration of Wolves (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	112, 117
Figure 36: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	112, 117
Figure 37: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	112

Figure 38: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	112
Figure 39: Wolf as Respectable Animal (Bruce Peninsula: Indigenous Gift Shop)	112
Figure 40: Coyote Pelt (Bruce Peninsula: Indigenous Gift Shop)	113
Figure 41: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	113
Figure 42: Wine Stoppers (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	114
Figure 43: Coffee Mugs (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	114
Figure 44: Bottle-Openers (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	114
Figure 45: Wildlife Nightlights (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	114
Figure 46: Music of Wildlife (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	114
Figure 47: Travel Mug (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	114
Figure 48: Moose Droppings (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	116
Figure 49: Canada Stuffed Moose (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	116, 117
Figure 50: Moose Coaster (Algonquin: Gift Shops)	116
Figure 51: Canada's Moose Wanted (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	116
Figure 52: Moose Dropping (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	116
Figure 53: Cartoon Canadian Wildlife (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	117
Figure 54: Maple Syrup (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	117
Figure 55: Algonquin: Logging Museum	117
Figure 56: Real Maple (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	117
Figure 57: Postcards of Wildlife and Canadian Identity (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	117
Figure 58: Canada Water Bottles (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	117
Figure 59: Key Chains of Canadian Symbolism (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	117
Figure 60: Canoe Dip Pot (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	119
Figure 61: Canoe T-Shirts (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	119
Figure 62: Algonquin Gift Shop	119
Figure 63: Inukshuk (Algonquin: Art Museum)	120
Figure 64: Algonquin: Art Museum	120
Figure 65: Algonquin: Art Museum	120
Figure 66: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	120
Figure 67: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	120
Figure 68: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	120
Figure 69: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	120
Figure 70: Healing Stones (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	120
Figure 71: Tribal Bracelets (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	121
Figure 72: Algonquin: Gift Shop	121
Figure 73: Spirit Bracelet (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	121
Figure 74: Medicine Stones (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	121
Figure 75: Totem Stones (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	121
Figure 76: Miniature Ceremonial Drums (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	121
Figure 77: Totem Zipper Pulls (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	121
Figure 78: Dream Catchers (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	121, 127
Figure 79: Ceremonial Masks (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	121
Figure 80: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	121
Figure 81: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	121
Figure 82: Feather Earnings (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	121

Figure 83: Feather Hair Extensions (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	121
Figure 84: Fashionable Bracelets (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	121
Figure 85: Indigenous People as Mannequins (Bruce Peninsula: Indigenous Gift Shop)	122, 127
Figure 86: Bruce Peninsula: Indigenous Gift Shop	122, 127
Figure 87: Bruce Peninsula: Indigenous Gift Shop	122, 127
Figure 88: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	122
Figure 89: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	122
Figure 90: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	122
Figure 91: Nobel Warrior ‘Savage’ (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	123
Figure 92: Indigenous Gift Shop-Wooden Shed (Bruce Peninsula)	123
Figure 93: Authentically Indigenous and Canadian (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	124
Figure 94: Animal Furs as Commodity Fashions (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	127
Figure 95: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	127
Figure 96: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop	127
Figure 97: Moose and Teepee (Bruce Peninsula: Indigenous Gift Shop)	127
Figure 98: Indigenous People, Fur and Teepee (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	127
Figure 99: Female Indigenous Hunter (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	127
Figure 100: Indigenous Female with Wolves (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)	128
Figure 101: Moccasin Stand Story (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	130
Figure 102: Canada Goose Jacket (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	131
Figure 103: Canada Goose Fur Policy Video of Indigenous ‘Support’	132
Figure 104: Moccasins (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	140
Figure 105: Natural Taxidermic Environment (Algonquin: Visitor Center)	148
Figure 106: Wolf Exhibit (Algonquin: Visitor Center)	149
Figure 107: Imaginary ‘Indian’ Exhibit (Algonquin: Visitor Center)	152
Figure 108: Warrior Hunter (Algonquin: Visitor Center)	152
Figure 109: Indigenous Woman Performing Gendered Practices of Beauty (Algonquin: Visitor Center)	152
Figure 110: Indigenous Elder (Algonquin: Visitor Center)	152
Figure 111: Primitive Living (Algonquin: Gift Shop)	152

## Chapter Six

Figure 112: Cabbagetown Coyote (Toronto Star Website)	173
---	-----

## **Introduction**

This thesis explores some important questions about Canadian nationalism and the spatialized enactment of contradictory attitudes White settler society holds towards social groups that are simultaneously marginalized and characterized as constitutive of Canadianness. I investigate these contradictions as they are played out in and through spaces constructed as wilderness. A central element of Canadian national mythology is a love of nature and the wilderness (Francis 1997). However, the ‘love’ of the wild is much more a fantasy and delusion, tinged with violence, that I reveal in my research through a spatial investigation of representation and attitudes.

Canada has defined its national identity as a country that celebrates the wilderness and natural bountiful landscapes. Many of Canada’s national symbols are visual representations of wildlife such as the beaver, loon, moose, and bear, as well as Indigenous cultural associations, such as the inukshuk engraved on the medals for the Vancouver Olympic Games in 2010 and numerous wilderness solitude images. Many Canadians internalize these national symbols as national identity and vehicles to attain cultural capital through the production and consumption of wilderness spaces (Baker 2002, Cronin 2011, Francis 1992). Wildlife, Indigenous culture, and wilderness landscapes are cherished visual symbols of Canada celebrated in protected spaces, such as Algonquin Provincial Park and Bruce Peninsula National Park. Baker (2002) and Cronin (2011) argue that nature parks allow tourists to accumulate cultural capital based upon the wilderness national identity fantasy that develops pride in nation and self as Canadian. There is an enhanced appreciation and sympathy towards wildlife, Indigenous people and nature that is embraced in nature parks. Baker (2002) says nature parks are a return to a ‘simpler’ life but this social construction of a simpler life entails activities and a lifestyle that are only acceptable in the contained space of a manufactured nature park. Furthermore, nature park fantasy spaces can be

healing for people during a time of societal turbulence, urban expansion and increasing anxiety about existence under the capitalist system; as Hermer states: “parks make us feel human at times when our humanity seems to be in question” (Baker 2002, Hermer 2002:103, LWW Conference 2012).

My research objective is twofold: 1) to explore the multiple and often contradictory representations and attitudes park visitors hold of animals and Indigenous people and 2) to examine how space informs these contradictory attitudes. To clarify this research examines the white settler relationship to Indigenous people and non-human animals and does not include the ‘violent love’ relationship settlers of colour may have with non-human animals and Indigenous people. The relationship forms a continuum, as the degree of loving or hating is fluid and always changing depending on space. Further, fluidity of loving or hating is grounded in distance, perceived threat status and is a reading of the socially constructed meanings of belonging in spaces and places.

### ***Research Questions***

My study focuses on three research questions:

1. To what extent is the phenomenon of violent love (see below) a dominant theme in representations and experiences of nature parks?
2. How are animals and Indigenous people produced relationally to manufacture nature park fantasies?
3. How are tourist constructions and relationships spatially organized in nature parks and urban life (GTA)?

Cronin (2011) and Jones (2002) have both articulated the connection between the conservation movements in the 1960s to an increase in positive public attitudes towards wildlife

and nature. Jones (2002) suggests that wolf restoration programs are a result of these increased positive attitudes. Contemporarily the wolf has become a potent symbol of the wilderness experience in national parks (Jones 2002). Baker (2002) reports Algonquin Provincial Park is a significant supporter of the protection of wolves in Ontario, Canada. However, Wakeham (2008) is highly critical of the rescue mission narrative that is entrenched in wildlife conservation debates and suggests that this narrative is also applied to the rescuing of Indigenous people who are portrayed as a population disappearing from an atavistic past. She sees the rescue mission as an attempt to mask the colonial violence and ‘extinction’ narrative that is reproduced literally and figuratively inside museums in Banff, Alberta. In my research, I extend Wakeham’s insights by examining ‘taxidermic’ (taxidermy) representations of wildlife and Indigenous people/culture at Algonquin Provincial Park and Bruce Peninsula National Park. My goal is to reveal the colonial representations of extinction and thingification that pervade nature parks despite their apparent adoption of a saviour role. These representations remain opaque to the casual observer, indicating the need for a critical sociological investigation. To further my investigation, I apply McClintock’s (1995) idea of a new type of racism, which she terms *commodity racism* to representations of Indigenous people. In doing so, I expand McClintock’s definition of commodity racism to derive a new concept, which I call *commodity speciesism*, to describe discrimination towards non-human animals. I define and discuss both these terms in **Chapter Five**. Moreover, by developing an analysis of how these two forms of discrimination are intertwined, I demonstrate how both Indigenous populations/culture and animals become commodities for tourist desires, fantasies, and trophies.

In this thesis I challenge liberal myths of progress. Attitudes and representations towards wolves and Indigenous people have shifted from a colonial context (changed to some degree, yet

reproduces colonial logic) and are far more complex than a static dichotomy of positive or negative. To clarify, when I refer to post-colonialism I am referring to Indigenous populations and non-human animals, since my research understands their shared oppression as a project of colonialism and the resulting conflicts over spatial belonging. In my discussion of nonhuman animals, I focus on representations of wolves in particular because the fear and wilderness associations they embody parallel attitudes toward and representations of Indigenous people. Both wolves and Indigenous people are groups who were residing in Canada prior to European ‘contact’ and both suffered from genocidal practices as a result of conflict over space. Attitudes towards both groups alter across space as a result of distance, exposure, and preconceived ideas of belonging or being ‘out of place’. Perceptions of Indigenous people and ‘wild’ animals being ‘out of place’ are a result of crossing an invisible boundary of wilderness and civilization and can result in the disciplining of animal and Indigenous bodies. We ascribe meaning to space through cultural representations that provide a set of principles about “acceptable activity and behaviour” in specific spaces (Cronin 2011: 4). For example, it is considered culturally acceptable to view wildlife in a national/provincial park, as animals have been defined as belonging in this specific contained space; indeed, wildlife viewing is synonymous with the wilderness experience. My research suggests that many park visitors feel differently about encountering wildlife or Indigenous people or culture in a wilderness setting than they would in an urban context (or non-nature space). Such encounters in the latter spaces disrupt and challenge perceptions of belonging, therefore resulting in conflict. I have analyzed some recent examples of such conflict involving wildlife in urban areas. The cases I focused on include: the extermination of a coyote who had entered the Cabbagetown community of Toronto in February 2013; the execution of a black bear who had entered a populated area in Burlington, Ontario in May 2012; and the killing

of a coyote who had attacked a young child in Oakville, Ontario in January 2012. My research suggests that such incidents are the result of a reactive approach that involves killing animals who are perceived as threats. Such an approach is a temporary and speciesist solution that fails to explore root causes to why more wildlife are entering urban areas.

A spatial investigation of attitudes toward and representations of wildlife and Indigenous people highlights the contradictions of the Canadian wilderness national identity across space, since a spatial analysis reveals the “operation of all systems of domination” (Razack 2002:6). Moreover, space functions as a tool to exclude, segregate and “manage social difference” (Wolch and Emel 1998: xiv). My findings from this research reveal that many conflicts with wildlife and Indigenous people are spatial disputes that result from the colonial project based on ideas about the march of western progress, whereby the perceived primitiveness and wilderness symbolism of both groups are in direct opposition to urban development and constructed ideas of who belongs in ‘civilization’.

Using these theoretical tools, I analyze the nature park experience at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula through observation (self-reflexivity), analyzing social artifacts (CDA) and using photographs as supplementary evidence to build my case. In this regard I follow methodological strategies used by Cronin (2011) and Hermer (2002), who collect photos, postcards and brochures to solidify their arguments. In my research project I apply this method of collecting social artifacts, but also utilize photos as a form of “memory experience” in order to provide insight into gift shop items, taxidermy and representation in the Parks. While my project employs participant observation while at the Parks I use photographs to supplement my observations of these spaces. Not only is photography useful to gather proof of the experience, but it is an activity inseparable from the wildlife tourist experience (Lemelin 2006).



In order to explore the many contradictions of the wildlife tourism experience, I employ Brian Luke's (1998) concept of *violent love*. Luke utilizes this concept in order to understand male hunters' relationships with non-human animals and nature. He states that many hunters report that their motivation is that they enjoy and 'love' nature and animals, despite the fact that they are participating in the violent act of killing. I adopt this concept of violent love to analyze the contradictory relationship many Canadians have with wildlife and Indigenous people. I do so by comparing representation of both groups in nature parks with news stories of reactions to and treatment of wildlife and Indigenous people when these groups are encountered in other spaces. I employ the concept of violent love to explore how Canadians are able to love and despise wildlife and Indigenous populations simultaneously. My research shows that 'loving' only occurs in spaces of containment or when the perceived 'threatening population' is diminishing and is therefore controlled. In other spaces, Canadians justify violence to remove individuals who cannot be 'controlled' in a sanitized city landscape. While some animals can pose danger to humans in specific situations, such dangers are exaggerated and misconceived and stem from a lack of education and insufficient financial resources to appropriately train urban communities to coexist with wildlife and if necessary to humanely remove and relocate animals.

Western society has been fascinated with people/items that have been socially constructed as primitive and this obsession with 'otherness' functions as a tool to evaluate ourselves in relation to the 'other' (Dubinsky 2004). This fascination with 'otherness' motivates many individuals to visit nature parks. This fascination helps to shape nature parks as a fantasy space where socially constructed differences are eroticized and romanticized. By analyzing differences in attitudes and representations across spatial boundaries my thesis exposes the contradictory violent love relationship Canadians experience in these spaces. While research has

been conducted on several topics related to my study (see below), the specific connection I reveal has not yet been identified elsewhere so I hope to make an original contribution to knowledge in this area. This research is a preliminary investigation of an important research area and social phenomenon that warrants attention, particularly in the current context, as Indigenous populations create greater visibility through the national Idle No More Movement, and other species resist the oppressive spatial boundaries that humans have socially constructed.

### ***Personal Positionality***

Over the past few years of my academic career, I have become increasingly concerned with a number of contradictions and ideological dilemmas. These concerns emerged during my undergraduate degree in which I focused on feminist criminology. More specifically, when I was exposed to feminist theory on gender oppression, I was forced to engage in reflexive practices of internal reflection on my own life and contradictions. Further, I have been a lifelong (18 years) vegetarian who resisted the consumption of animal products at an early age. At that time I did not have a deep understanding of my reasoning for being vegetarian, other than that I admired animals and believed they should all be given moral consideration. However, I was a vegetarian who also wore purses made from animal skins (leather). I remained unaware of the contradiction of choosing not to consume cows' bodies, yet continuing to wear them.

My first realization of such a contradiction in my relationship towards animals came when I watched the documentary "*The Corporation*" in an introductory criminology course. The documentary included a discussion of the mass-production involved in the dairy industry, disabling my fantasy that cows resided on grassy pastures and were treated humanely. As I gained more insight on corporate social responsibility, I became interested in the corporate crime involved in the meat industry. Eisnitz (2007), Pachirat (2011), Schlosser (2002), Sinclair (2006)

and Torres (2007) explore how the meat industry is an example of institutionalized state sanctioned violence and corporate crime. The corporations that run slaughterhouses and factory farms commit numerous insidious crimes towards the animals, workers and consumers, yet in practice are not held legally responsible (Eisnitz 2007, Pachirat 2011). Exploitation and crimes are normalized, since animal agriculture corporations exercise a high level of power with minimal enforcement of violence (Pachirat 2011, Schlosser 2002, Sinclair 2006). By the end of my fourth year of university I was an animal rights advocate, living a vegan lifestyle. As I became more conscious about widespread animal oppression and the ideological framework of speciesism, I became primarily interested in contradictions with our relationships towards animals. While many contradictions exist within society, the most conflicted and complex ones are those involving our relations with non-human animals.

In a critical race graduate course at Brock University, I was challenged to rethink my White privilege at a more intense level. At this time, I began to think about contradictions Whites express towards Indigenous populations. When I explored the fur industry in the final course paper, I became interested in the violent love relationships we express towards wild animals. The contradictions that I first explored in the graduate course on race led to the formulation of this research project. I began my investigation by looking internally and questioning my relationship and attitudes towards predator species and Indigenous populations. Both of these social groups are a fantasy to me, as a result of my privileged social position. Growing up in a smaller, predominately White community has contributed to my understanding of the negative attitudes people express towards Indigenous people. My minimal exposure to Indigenous people and limited knowledge of Indigenous social injustices prior to my university education has influenced my decision to investigate Indigenous representation across space. Further, I have

always had an irrational fear of predator species, including wolves and bears. These internal investigations led me to question my own contradictions. Why do I fear wolves, when I love dogs (a similar species)? Would I fear a wolf more if I saw one in my own neighbourhood rather than in Algonquin Park or Bruce Peninsula? My sense that I would be significantly more afraid to see one in close proximity in the city of Burlington inspired me to explore this contradiction further. I believe that my research for this thesis reveals some explanations as to how our relationships with “other” bodies are spatially organized.

Other personal observations also contributed to my understanding of the magnitude of these contradictions. I have met numerous people who claim to ‘love’ animals and may even claim to be vegan, yet who choose to wear animal-derived items, such as moccasins. Seemingly, the relations of domination that exist behind such commodity fetish items remain completely invisible and unrecognized. Further contradictions emerged when I attended the Living with Wildlife conference in Toronto 2012. One speaker, a representative from the Ministry of Natural Resources for the Bear Wise Program, advocated for protection of bears through shifting social attitudes. After the panel session, I approached her to further discuss bear protection and she informed me that she regularly hunts bears, wolves, deer and any other animal who comes onto what she perceives as her property (of course animals do not understand these boundaries). I was shocked by this admission, by an individual who advocated for bear protection publicly but who, admitted in a private conversation that she engaged in violent discipline towards wild animals.

Such, contradictions inspired me to investigate how we construct Canadian national identity. As Canadians, we identify as wilderness lovers (Francis 1997). We use Indigenous cultural symbolism to promote tourism to wilderness spaces and to represent our nation, as exemplified in the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympic Games. However, the situation of

Indigenous people in Canada is comparable to some of the most impoverished slums of the Third World. Furthermore our claim to be a nation of animal lovers is reflected on all of the Canadian coin currency, despite the fact that wild animals who venture into urban spaces are routinely exterminated.

Overall, my own personal contradictions contributed to my understanding of the social phenomenon I am investigating in this thesis. The reflexivity involved in the process of challenging internal contradictions has led to my engagement with social injustices and contributed to my goal to support liberation struggles. Exposing such contradictions is essential in order to dismantle myths and fantasies about marginalized groups that support constructions of Canadian benevolence. My research encourages readers to take responsibility for reproducing racist and speciesist attitudes that contribute to the disciplining and deaths of Indigenous and animal populations and their containment to specific spaces. Revealing contradictions encourages individuals to engage in internal reflection, reflexivity and rethinking practices of domination, leading to liberation goals, as individuals *unlearn their human and race privileges*. Reflecting on experiences of oppression is a much more common approach in the field of social sciences, yet it is our taken for granted privileges that must equally be evaluated if we are ever to achieve real ‘progress’.

My positionality has led me to reflect on the power that White humans exert over individuals subordinated by the colonial project. Further, I am driven by my specific concerns over the illusion of progress in society that masks the complexities of social oppression, some of which I hope to reveal in this thesis through a spatial analysis. While this project explores many facets of a social phenomenon that is fundamental to Canadian society, much more research remains to be done. This is a complex research area. This project is just one step towards the

endless battle to raise public consciousness of oppression that marginalized groups (human and non-human animals) experience in Canadian society. Finally, my project encourages others to examine the intersections of speciesism and white settler colonialism, as I suggest throughout my thesis they are constitutive of each other and not separate.

## Chapter One: Literature Review

Most of the research that has been conducted in this academic field reproduces speciesist ideologies and simplifies our relationships' with 'wild' animals, specifically wolves. My research was inspired by my observation that no previous research addresses the complex spatial relationships we express towards colonized bodies (for example wolves and Indigenous people). I refer to my project as a puzzle that attempts to make sense of a complex phenomenon, which requires the analysis of distinct research areas. In this chapter I highlight research gaps and indicate the importance of my research.

### *Nationalism, Environmentalism and Nature*

Canadian nationalism is an important overarching theme within my research. Canada is a country that is widely recognized internationally as a vast wilderness landscape (Francis 1997). As a nation, Canadians pride themselves as multicultural and our national symbolism strongly identifies us as animal and nature lovers, as well as a country that celebrates Indigeneity (Cronin 2011, Francis 1992, Francis 1997, Sorenson 2010). This construction of Canada is a fantasy that has consequences for the populations mentioned above who are routinely exploited for the benefit of White settler colonialism.

Cronin (2011) conducts a critical analysis case study on Jasper National Park utilizing an ecocritical art historical methodology. She situates the importance of her project as she argues "visual culture, regional specificity, and national symbolism have influenced environmental perceptions and realities, both in Jasper National Park and the broader context of the Canadian nation" (Cronin 2011: 1). Her research reveals that manufactured constructions of nature result in exploited nature in Jasper National Park. Cronin recognizes the important role national parks function in constructing Canadian imagination. The wilderness iconology of Canada also includes Indigenous people/culture and wild animals. Francis (1997) conducts an investigation

into Canadians national mythologies. He calls these *national dreams*. National dreams are fantasies Canadians believe about themselves in order to mask colonial relations. A central point of analysis for Thorpe (2012) is the role that wilderness spaces (Temagami forest) play in terms of the Canadian national identity that serves the interests of White (male) elites at the expense of colonized populations and non-human life.

Francis suggests the wilderness ideology reflects Canadians self-delusional relationship with the natural world. Cronin (2011) and Francis (1997) both provide convincing arguments that the construction of ‘wilderness’ is heavily attached to Canadian national identity. They are also both acutely aware of the contradiction of this myth and explore how nature and Indigenous people are exploited while simultaneously being celebrated as central to Canadian national identity (Cronin 2011, Francis 1997). This contributes to myth-making that Canada is superior to other countries in terms of the protection and stewardship we offer to the populations we associate with the ‘wilderness’. This also leads to fantasies that Canada has achieved a higher level of social ‘progress’.

Francis (1997) reveals that symbols and specific sites are excellent ways to consume Canadian identity and *national dreams*. These symbols often include: nature, animals and Indigenous people/cultural artifacts. The wilderness experience in nature parks is consumed through symbols and Baker (2002) suggests a “series of representations” (200). Baker’s reports that Algonquin Provincial Park is experienced through images and symbols that produce ideas of the wilderness. Canadians’ association of these populations with ‘wilderness’ (wild animals and Indigenous people) is a socially constructed ordering that normalizes who belongs in wilderness spaces. This secures relations of domination and aids in the maintenance of Canadian innocence.

In parks, wolf tourism is encouraged as part of the ‘wilderness’ experience (Wilson and



Heberlein 1996). Yet, according to Kellert's (1985) research, wilderness symbolism associated with wolves is one of the constructions that have resulted in their stigmatization and extermination. Thus the 'symbols' of the Canadian 'wilderness' examined in this research project are highly contradictory ones. The wilderness experience is a fantasy that allows visitors to consume a sanitized version of Canadian history and culture.

There is a widespread belief that people can experience the 'wilderness' non-consumptively (Cronin 2011, Hermer 2002, Lemelin 2006). However, the manufacturing and production of wilderness spaces has been identified by researchers as highly consumptive that often lead to exploitation (Cronin 2011, Hermer 2002, Lemelin 2006). Baker's (2002) research highlights how nature parks produce capitalist consumptive practices. These researchers reject the dichotomy of consumptive vs. non-consumptive nature.

Lemelin's (2006) field research in Churchill, Manitoba in Canada examined the relationship between photography and the wildlife tourist gaze. He refers to this process as *ocular consumption*. Lemelin's (2006) study reveals the important role photographs play as a form of memory of the tourist experience. Lemelin (2006) also maintains that *ocular consumption* results in the exploitation of the 'natural' environment. Thus, exploitation occurs as a result of high levels of wildlife tourism (seeking out and photographing animals) in sensitive regions (Lemelin 2006). Cronin's (2011) research is also critical of photography. She argues photos are a significant contributor to the commodification of the Canadian wilderness that reinforces cultural ideas specific to nature spaces, and understandings of space are mediated through photographic imagery. Cronin's (2011) research examines how manufacturing national parks leads to environmental degradation, yet landscape photos portray the space as pristine and undamaged from tourism.

Hermer's (2002) findings reveal a key paradox: in order to experience the wilderness, park visitors must adhere to rigid practices of regulation and order. On the one hand, the wilderness is associated with freedom; however Hermer reports that nature parks are equally oppressive and are places that enforce state rules of personal conduct and behaviour. Some examples of order and regulation at parks include: strict park regulations on alcohol consumption, day and night conduct, peace and quiet, hygiene and sanitation, and open fires (Hermer 2002). Hermer argues the regulation and order inside parks is an extension of state power to discipline people who transgress moral behaviours. Another noteworthy aspect of Hermer's study is his discussion on *regulated exploitation* in which he defines the ordered appearance of Algonquin Provincial Park as being aligned with the moral ideologies attached to constructions of the 'wilderness'.

The popular conception among the public is that nature spaces, are natural spaces that do not suffer environmental and ecological consequences from tourist consumption. Cronin (2011), Hermer (2002) and Lemelin's (2006) research challenges this belief. The destruction within exploited landscapes (nature tourist spaces) is concealed in order to maintain the image of purity. Baker (2002) shows from her insights acquired through her spatial analysis at Algonquin that space managers reveal and hide practices that disrupt socially constructed meanings attached to landscapes (i.e. logging in Algonquin). These researchers collectively contribute to an important discussion on how the wilderness experience involves destructive consumption of the landscape and how practices of exploitative consumption are concealed to tourists, in order to ensure wilderness fantasies remain intact.

Wilson and Heberlein (1996) employ a conceptual framework study that examines the phenomenon of the 'wolf' as a popular tourist attraction. The researchers reveal a continuum of

wolf tourism that ranges from wolf captivity (high control) to field tracking a wild wolf (low control). According to Wilson and Heberlein (1996), there is a growing population of Americans participating in ‘non-consumptive’ wildlife recreation (non-hunting). However, experiencing wild wolves is rare and usually involves some degree of control, which is a practice of consumption (Wilson and Heberlein 1996). In many ‘wilderness’ spaces (i.e. Algonquin) the ‘wolf’ is a tourist spectacle and becomes an extension of the wilderness tourist experience (Wilson and Heberlein 1996). Wilson and Heberlein’s (1996) research is important since they challenge widespread beliefs that wolves are free in all ‘wild’ spaces and that wolf tourism is non-consumptive.

Theberge and Theberge (2004) are experts on wolf ecology at Algonquin Park. They used radio-collars to track wild wolves within Algonquin and the communities surrounding the Park. Theberge and Theberge (2004) argue their field tracking research is essential in order to produce knowledge that will aid in wolf protection and conservation. Their findings have contributed to important knowledge about Algonquin wolves’ that has resulted in their popularity. Further, wolves are not only an extension of the wilderness experience, for many visitors wolf tourism is the primary reason to visit Algonquin.

A major tension in the literature is the culture-nature dualism. Academics have recognized the consequences of creating mythical spatial boundaries of civilization and wilderness (Cronin 2011, Hermer 2002, Sterba 2012, Thorpe 2012). They argue that the social construction of space results in normalized exploitation and creates categories of belonging and exclusion.

Cronin (2011) evaluates the complexity of space and rejects dualisms of the culture-nature divide. Her research reveals that the socially constructed culture-nature dichotomy is

responsible for the misconception of the environmental degradation that occurs at Jasper National Park. Hermer (2002) argues we must abandon beliefs that nature is ‘other’ and something that can be returned to and stepped outside of. His research at Algonquin Provincial Park reveals practices of discipline and forces of regulation that tourists are expected to adhere to that challenge perceptions that parks are spaces of freedom. Moreover, Hermer (2002) reports from his research that we are just as controlled in ‘wilderness’ spaces as we are in spaces of ‘civilization’.

Baker (2002), Hermer (2002) and Thorpe (2012) all analyze how ‘wilderness’ landscapes have a normalizing effect on exploitation that occurs within socially constructed nature spaces. A study by Thorpe (2012) problematizes the discourse of wilderness and the meanings attached to this construction through her critical analysis of the Temagami forest in Ontario, Canada. Through the normalization of nature, important histories and practices of violence/displacement are concealed that reproduces unequal power relations. Thorpe’s research is primarily interested in how the making of the Temagami ‘wild’ has resulted in the disenfranchisement of Indigenous populations. She reveals how the naturalness of Temagami operates an instrumental role in securing colonial processes. A key finding was the importance of dismantling the social construction of nature and challenging naturalized ‘wilderness’ landscapes. Thorpe (2012) argues this shift in thinking provides a framework of study that encourages examination of the European imperialism that keeps the White colonial project alive through the erasure and subjugation of ‘othered’ populations. These researchers advocate the divorce from this dualistic thinking in order to dismantle the normalized power relations that operate within either spaces of ‘civilization’ or ‘wilderness’ (Baker 2002, Cronin 2011, Hermer 2002, Thorpe 2012).

Challenging the nature-culture divide is essential to examining socio-spatial constructions of belonging and exclusion, since Razack (2002) argues space secures power.

Sterba (2012) also challenges beliefs that nature and culture are separate spaces to categorize wildlife belonging. His research analyzes the increase in wildlife entering urban 'human' populated areas. Sterba (2012) reports that humans now live closer to wildlife than previous generations, as a result of that has led to more animal protection. Cronin (2011), Hermer (2002) and Thorpe's (2012) research is more focused on critiquing the 'nature' aspect of the culture-nature debate, whereas Sterba's (2012) investigation reveals the growing 'problem' of wildlife entering 'human' areas (urban and suburban areas). Together these researchers analyze important questions surrounding the dualistic rhetoric on the social construction of nature and culture, and the consequences this divide has on non-human animal populations, nature and Indigenous communities. The socio-spatial project normalizes belonging and exclusion. This normalization of social ordering may be important during a time of White decline in a country (Canada) experiencing a continuous influx of immigrants. Further, human hegemony is threatened with the increase of predator animals entering urban areas.

### *Speciesism and Social Construction of Animals*

Some important literature has explored public attitudes, perceptions and representations towards animals, more specifically wolves (*canis lupus*) and the wolf hybrid, coyotes (*canis latrans*). Wolves trigger many emotions in people- they embody wilderness, resistance and untamed nature of North America prior to contact with European colonizers (Jones 2002, Lopez 1978). Humans' relationships, attitudes and representations of wolves have fundamentally shifted over time and across regions (Jones 2002, Grambo 2008). Coexistence with wolves is a

public debate that is connected to the perpetual social construction of wolves as a threat that ignites fear and “what one fears one destroys” (Chief Dan George as cited in Andrews 1993).

Figari and Skogen (2011) examine the social representation and cultural meanings of wolves through their focus group interview research (45 participants) in two rural areas of Eastern Norway, with the aim to understand social conflicts surrounding wolf recovery. More specifically, they investigate the conflicting attitudes towards wolves’ presence and their representation, as well as how wolves are perceived by rural residents. The interviewees expressed nostalgia for wolves. The study results revealed that participants admired wolves’ uniqueness, sociability, intelligence, and excellent hunting skills that simultaneously fuelled their fears that pack wolves threaten rural living. Findings suggest that the conflict concerning wolves is a result of their representation as wild. The presence of wolves in a ‘human’ community was reported by interviewees to be a “transgression of the symbolic boundary” between the socially constructed boundaries of wild and civilized, thus a conflict between belonging in spaces (Figari and Skogen 2011: 324).

The social construction of certain animals is also a historical construction that is influenced by economic, political and social agendas to control specific animal populations (Kellert, Black, Rush and Bath 1995). Kellert (1985) argues wolves are continuously viewed as an impediment to western progress, expansion and human interests. Coyotes are constructed as a pest and nuisance that warrants control (Kellert 1985). Kellert’s (1985) national study reports that the social construction of wolves as predators, carnivores, property destroyers (land and farm animals), and creatures of the ‘wilderness’ are some of the justifying factors that have led to the hatred and callous treatment undertaken towards wolves.

Our relationship with wolves is complicated within mainstream society (rural and urban spaces). On the other hand, wolves are often constructed as majestic and noble animals in wilderness tourist spaces (Wilson and Heberlein 1996). However, Wilson and Heberlein (1996) report wolves are rarely a tourist activity on their own. Wolves often become a source of tourism as an extension of other wilderness recreational activities. In very few cases, there is a small niche group of wolf tourists (humans seeking out wolves for recreation) that are primarily a population of people who are highly educated and from a privileged socio-economic background (Wilson and Heberlein 1996).

Research reveals that some species generate more affection and sympathy from humans, while others ignite hatred and fear (Kellert 1985). Figari and Skogen's work shows how humans' understanding of different "species are bound to time and space" (319). Figari and Skogen are acutely aware of the important influence that threat status and spatial location of predator animals have on representations and attitudes held by people, which influences decisions to protect them or justify extermination. Kellert, Black, Rush and Bath (1995) examine and compare human attitudes (data collected from primary research and secondary data analysis) towards large predator animals including: wolves, grizzly bears and mountain lions in the United States and Canada, specifically focusing on the Rocky Mountains region. Kellert et al (1995) discuss how negative attitudes towards top-predators are bound-up with fears of livestock eating and consumption of prey animals, therefore creating a perceived shortage for hunters. Arluke and Sander's (1996) concept '*sociozoologic scale*' is a useful term in order to understand why wolves/coyotes are constructed as 'bad' animals. According to the sociozoologic scale, different animals are categorized by the role they play in humans' lives (Arluke and Sanders 1996). Wolves/coyotes according to this logic are constructed as 'bad' animals since they cause trouble

for us (eating ‘livestock’) and they do not know their place, as well as make us afraid since they are a predator species (Arluke and Sanders 1996). Kellert’s (1985) national study in the United States revealed that wolves and coyotes were the most despised animals in comparison to all other animals in the study. The categorization and construction of wolves/coyotes as wild carnivores has resulted in their discrimination (Kellert 1985). Humans fear and are simultaneously fascinated with untamed nature and ‘wild’ species (Francis 1997, Lopez 1978). This association of wolves and wilderness has resulted in stigmatization. Our relationship with the wilderness and wolves is best explained as a ‘love affair’ that is often contradictory and easily manipulated depending on other social, economic and political variables.

There is a widely held belief that there has been an increase in positive attitudes towards wolves (i.e. social progress) since early colonial times. This is documented by the conservation efforts to protect wolves (Jones 2002). Attitudes towards wolves (and many other animals) are much more complicated. Progress and victory for the entire species cannot be generalized to all wolves, as the research demonstrates.

Houston, Bruskotter and Fan (2010) observed that much research on public attitudes towards wolves has neglected to empirically study the popular belief that attitudes towards wolves have transformed from negative to positive. They undertake a quantitative approach to examine how “attitudes toward wolves vary across regions or change over time” through employing a longitudinal study (ten years 1999-2008) and a content analysis research design (391). Results indicate a decline in favourable attitudes towards wolves as expressed in the media (Houston et al 2010). Their research contributes to the debate on the complexity of attitudes towards wolf recovery.



Williams, Ericsson and Heberlein (2002) conducted an international quantitative research study (data collected from 38 surveys from three library databases) from 1972-2000, that examined support for wolves. Their results revealed that approximately six in ten people support wolf reintroduction and express positive attitudes, 25% remain ambivalent. However, the scholars report that generally over time, attitudes towards wolves have not become more positive. They suggest this is because most of the significant attitude changes occurred from the 1930s to the 1970s. In the past 30 years there has been an emergence in research on wolves, yet the most attitude changes took place before this study period. A key finding of their research is that attitudes are not only diverse across space, but people's attitudes change over time. Williams et al (2002) challenge the notion of wolf progress through their research findings that attitudes towards wolves are never fixed, and are always changing over time and in different places. Kellert, Black, Rush and Bath's (1995) research also challenges the belief that predator species are fully protected. Their research evaluates the role of colonialism and human progress that affects attitudes towards predator species.

Monitoring social attitudes is imperative to successful wolf recovery programs, since attitudes strongly influence behaviour (Houston, Bruskotter and Fan 2010). Williams, Ericsson and Heberlein's (2002) results reveal similar findings to Kellert (1985), Kellert et al (1995) and Zimmermann et al (2001) that education is strongly correlated with positive attitudes towards wolves.

We must learn how to overcome the first arrival hatred that is attached to carnivore animals through education, and preventative methods that will assist in their immigration into human-urban regions (Zimmermann et al 2001). Some suggestions include: prevention of livestock losses, compensation programs, local monitoring, and enhanced knowledge through

research (Zimmermann et al 2001). Karlsson and Sjöström (2007) advocate that good/positive experiences with wolves should be discussed in conversations, and in the media that will contribute to more positive attitudes in regions experiencing more contact with wolves.

Sterba (2012) analyzes the increase in wildlife entering urban ‘human’ populated areas. Sterba (2012) reports that humans now live closer to wildlife than they did in previous generations, as a result of urban sprawl that has encroached into animal habitats’, and from a shift in social attitudes that has led to more animal protection. Sterba (2012) argues that we have become *denatured*, as a result of humans being alienated from the natural world. According to Sterba (2012), if we are looking to come up with solutions to urban wildlife, we must relearn nature by reconnecting with the land and animals.

The literature reveals how education and knowledge about predator species can deter circulation of negative attitudes in wolf/coyote areas. Using educational strategies as an instrument for change can result in myth breaking, ending species discrimination and speciesist ideologies. Unlearning our negative attitudes towards wolves can promote opportunities for successful coexistence in urban areas recently experiencing an increase in visible urban predator species.

### *Indigeneity and Race Studies*

Historically, attitudes towards Indigenous people and animals have been similar in colonial Canada, and contemporarily continue to ignite diverse and contradictory attitudes depending on spatial location (Coleman 2004, Jones 2002, Kellert 1985, Spence 1999). Dubinsky (2004) reports there has always been a western fascination with what has been socially constructed as primitive. Mariana Torgovnik argues this obsession with ‘otherness’ is a tool to evaluate ourselves in relation to the other and therefore judge individual and national progress

(Dubinsky 2004, McClintock 1995, Torgovnik 1990). Dubinsky (2004) argues Indigenous people are tourist attractions, in addition to their culture being commodified by non-Indigenous people. Wilson and Heberlein (1996) report that wolves have been transformed into a tourist spectacle to be gazed upon, viewed as majestic animals embodying wilderness. Harding's (2006) research reveals that negative attitudes persist towards Indigenous people and Houston, Bruskotter and Fan (2010) report similar findings for wolves. The literature reveals that our relationships with wildlife and Indigenous people are highly contradictory and change across space.

As a result of the construction of Canadian national identity using Indigenous cultural symbolism, many people within Canada have romanticized images of Indigenous people (Francis 1992, Francis 1997). Francis (1992) conducts a critical analysis through his examination of images and stereotypes in textbooks, museums/artwork and the media that are held by non-Indigenous Canadians about Indigenous people. His findings reveal a dominant theme that Canadians consistently demonstrate a contradictory relationship with Indigenous people. He argues Indigenous people are often represented as either vanishing, or are constructed as primitive and inferior (Francis 1992). The research highlighted above suggests that the war on Indigenous people in Canada has never ended.

Scholars have demonstrated how Indigenous populations in Canada continue to experience social exclusion, marginalization, poverty, cultural genocide, and government negligence in resolving social/economic needs for these at risk communities (Culhane 2009, McGill 2008, Razack 2002). Harding's (2006) research employs a critical discourse analysis (CDA) to examine historical representations (1860s-1990s) of Indigenous people and issues in the Canadian news media in order to situate the "contemporary socio-political context" (205).

Harding found in his investigation on different media sources that Indigenous issues are sensationalized that perpetuate stereotypes and therefore “reproduce material and social inequality” (2006). Further, Indigenous people are depicted in the media as inferior, emotional and are infantilized (Harding 2006). As a result, these representations produce a racist ideology that aids in the maintenance of White dominance through the continuous subjugation of others (Harding 2006). Francis (1992) argues our representation of Indigenous people is a consequence of continued colonial practices that shape myths about Canadians and create identities of belonging and exclusion.

Progress is a national mythology that supports white supremacy. Many scholars confront this fantasy that we live in a post-colonial and post-racial state (Harding 2006, Razack 2002, Wakeham 2008, Wise 2009). Harding’s (2006) critical discourse analysis of news representations of Indigenous people reveals that news discourses’ portrayals of Indigenous people have remained similar over a century and a half. Harding’s research reveals that the framing of Indigenous social issues in the 1990s is similar to the representations during earlier colonial times in Canada. He argues negative representations of “Indigenous people as a threat” to others and themselves are discourses that aid in the protection of the dominant interests of the White nation (Harding 2006:205). Harding’s (2006) findings contribute to the discussion on challenging post-colonialism. Harding’s research reveals that within urban spaces Indigenous people continue to be viewed negatively and are represented/articulated through colonial discourses, despite being romanticized in nature parks (Cronin 2011, Francis 1992, Wakeham 2008).

Wakeham (2008) explores how taxidermy (plastic Indigenous mannequins and animals) in museums reproduce relations of power, domination and colonialism. Wakeham (2008) argues

taxidermic transformation reinforces colonial mastery over bodies deemed threats to White western progress. Wakeham's (2008) research contributes to the discussion on nature parks' role in reinforcing and masking colonial relations, while simultaneously creating the appearance to tourists that the parks have adopted a saviour role by preserving 'threatened' (groups believed to be disappearing) populations. Her work is an important contribution to challenging fantasies of post-colonialism and social progress for Indigenous populations.

Francis (1992) also examines how colonial practices continue to be perpetrated against Indigenous populations in Canada. His findings suggest that the '*Imaginary Indian*' is a creation of European time and is a White man's fantasy that is a spectacle for non-Indigenous people to judge their progress. His work reveals that the representation of Indigenous people changes over time yet continues to reproduce negative stereotypes.

Many scholars who discuss the conflation of animals, Indigenous people and nature adopt a speciesist lens. This oppressive framework views the animalization of Indigenous people, and the construction of inferiority of nature and animals with Indigenous people, as an insidious racist practice. However, this normalizes human domination and a naturalized hierarchy of worth (humans trumping animals and nature) that I challenge within this thesis.

The conflation of Indigeneity and animality is not a contemporary phenomenon. Coleman (2004) reveals that in the 1660s, "colonists displayed the heads of wolves and Indians to proclaim their dominance over beasts and beast-like men" (45). Wakeham (2008) examines North America's northwest in order to analyze the naturalization of the "affiliation between animality and Aboriginality" in museums, photography and cinema (1-3). Wakeham (2008) adopts a conceptual project utilizing a Foucauldian analysis in order to explore and deconstruct taxidermy. She defines her understanding of taxidermy as "a specific technology of

representation and also a sign system that travels beyond the material practices” of violence and instead is “reconfigured across time, space and multiple social texts” (6, 8). Her findings suggest taxidermic signs are used to reinforce colonial goals and mastery over nature. Taxidermic signs are often found in the same spaces (museums) that are simultaneously creating the appearance to visitors that the institution has adopted a rescue role in preserving a disappearing past. Wakeham (2008) defines taxidermy not only the stuffing of animal bodies but also the plastic mannequin ‘Indians’ in museums as signs of a ‘disappearing’ culture. Francis (1992) also reports that Indigenous people are often conflated with animals and nature as a strategy to dehumanize them and classify them as inferior, in order to justify White control and surveillance.

Byrne (2012) argues that many national parks are spaces of White nature that are manufactured by, and for, White people. Byrne (2012) conducted a focus group study with 14 Latino participants in Los Angeles in order to understand the cultural politics of race at the Santa Monica Mountains Recreation Area (National Park). Results reveal that one of the significant reasons participants were deterred from visiting the Park was a consequence of feeling they were not welcome in what they perceived as a white territory (72% of Park visitors are White). Participants also reported that the type of ‘nature’ in the Park is one that promotes White recreational activities that further led to participants feeling they would experience xenophobia in the Park.

Byrne and Wolch (2009) examine previous scholarship on geographic perspectives on park use in order to understand the contradictions of the ‘park idea’. They reveal how parks are spaces of Whiteness that promote White ideas of nature, including individualism (i.e. solitude canoeing in unpeopled spaces). The most important arguments made by Byrne and Wolch (2009) is that parks function as a space of social control that discipline racialized and impoverished

bodies. Byrne and Wolch (2009) and Wakeham (2008) both examine how practices of discipline and domination are enacted in spaces of presumed naturalness. Baker's (2002) analysis reveals that despite the appearance that Algonquin is a wilderness, the Park is organized to produce class distinctions through consumption practices that shape tourists identities. This literature exposes how 'wilderness' landscapes are racialized spaces and produce a White middle-class experience that appeals to White fantasies of progress.

### *Space and Attitudes towards Predator Animals*

Distance and exposure to wolves and other top-predator species are strong determining factors that influence public attitudes (Figari and Skogen 2011, Houston, Bruskotter and Fan 2010, Karlsson and Sjostrom 2007, Kellert 1985, Kellert et al 1995, Zimmermann et al 2001). Research on public attitudes and distance to wolves has been a popular study area for academics, yet most of the research understands space as static. Figari and Skogen (2011), Houston, Bruskotter and Fan (2010), Karlsson and Sjostrom (2007), Kellert et al (1995) and Zimmermann et al (2001) all report that the further away respondents reside from wolf territories, the more positive their attitudes were.

Karlsson and Sjostrom (2007) employed a multiple regression (ordered probit model) to test the hypothesis that location (distance to wolf territory) influenced attitudes towards wolves in south-central Scandinavia. The results from their questionnaire revealed that attitudes varied significantly between residents living in wolf territories in comparison to the general population of Sweden. Positive correlations were reported to be linked to the respondents distance (150-200 km's or more away from a wolf territory). Their key finding that distinguishes their work is that they correlate negative attitudes held by people in wolf territories to not only be linked to direct experience, but also by how many kilometres away an individual lives from wolf territory. The

researchers explain that the people, who live within the range of 150-200 km, are more exposed to negative information about wolves. This may explain why people who live close to wolf territories generally express more negative attitudes. Therefore their findings suggest that indirect experiences may be just as important in influencing attitudes as personal direct experiences with wolves.

Zimmermann, Wabakken and Dotterer (2001) analyzed predator acceptance interview surveys (past 12 year time-frame and different regions) in Norway, with the aim to understand distance and how the duration of living in the same area influences attitudes. Their findings reveal a sharp increase in negative attitudes with the initial arrival of carnivore species (first arrival thesis). The researchers report that over time, with exposure to predators that negative attitudes will eventually decrease. From this finding Zimmermann et al (2001) advocate more prevention that will aid in decreasing negative attitudes, before and after carnivore arrival. Kellert (1985) found that distance strongly impacted interview participants' attitudes towards coyotes and wolves. Figari and Skogen (2011) report rural residents exposure to wolf territory impacted their level of fear. This literature collectively reveals the important role distance and exposure function in constructing negative attitudes towards wolves.

Sharp differences between urban dwellers and rural residents reveal important demographic differences that alter perceptions of predators as pests, or symbols of the wilderness (Kellert, Black, Rush and Bath 1995). The strongest positive attitudes are reportedly held by urban residents, young adults, college-educated individuals who routinely engage in outdoor recreation, as well as members of environmental organizations as reported in a U.S. national study of animal-related attitudes, knowledge and behaviour (Kellert 1985). The myth of culture



and nature as separate spaces has consequences for researchers who imagine specific spaces as places that contain specific animals.

Houston, Bruskotter and Fan's (2010) research evidence reports that new wolf populated areas endure conflict and negative attitudes towards wolves. They report the states and "provinces without wolves had the fewest negative attitudes" expressed in the news stories, while the regions that experienced new wolf populations had the highest reported negative attitudes in the media (Houston, Bruskotter and Fan 2010: 398). Karlsson and Sjostrom (2007) also suggest as wolves colonize a new area that attitudes towards them will become more negative.

Williams, Ericsson and Heberlein's (2002) data demonstrates that people with fewer experiences with wolves (urban residents) express the most positive results and the researchers suggest the positive incline will likely increase as more people are isolated from nature. These researchers also report that places experiencing successful reintroduction or restored/returning populations will import an increase in negative attitudes. Sterba's (2012) research exposes a tension to Williams et al's (2002) findings. Sterba (2012) argues that the culture-nature boundaries are more blurred than any other time in history. Therefore, Williams et al's (2002) research fails to account for the increase in urban top-predator species and how this phenomenon will affect attitudes towards wolves. The research findings continually articulate urban space as empty of wolf/coyote populations, except for Sterba (2012) who argues urban and suburban regions are experiencing an emergence of large wildlife species. The above discussion has highlighted an important literature gap on understanding the complexity of wolf attitudes and has aimed to demonstrate how increases in urban wolf/coyote populations will affect attitudes towards the species as a whole.

Kellert, Black, Rush and Bath (1995) report attitudes towards wolves, grizzly bears and mountain lions vary across space. Findings indicate that rural residents of the Rocky Mountain area express more negative attitudes towards grizzly bears and nature landscapes, since protection measures are viewed as an interference with rural life and identity (i.e. hunting, logging and livestock production) (Kellert et al 1995). Figari and Skogen's (2011) findings similarly reveal that negative attitudes towards wolves were linked to fear of losing rural identity.

Kellert (1985) reveals that education, age, and city population are important factors that influence positive or negative attitudes toward carnivore species. Livestock producers reported the most negative attitudes that justified violent control methods (Kellert 1985). The most positive attitudes were occupied by nature conservationists, post-secondary educated individuals and importantly the respondents who viewed wolves and coyotes positively demonstrated greater opposition to the exploitation of all animals (Kellert 1985). Karlsson and Sjöström (2007) revealed from their study that age is an influencing factor in determining the expression of positive or negative attitudes towards wolves. Their findings exposed the most positive attitudes are held by the age group 18-25, and the most negative were held by the group 65 years, or older. The literature on attitudes towards predator species reveals that attitudes are shaped by a set of complex social, demographic and geographical factors. Specifically, my review of research on reactions and attitudes towards wolves has influenced my decision to highlight their oppression with the larger goal of challenging fantasies of 'progress' that White people experience with colonial bodies in a Canadian context.

## Research Gaps and Chapter Summary

The literature review presents important themes that set the context for my research project. My research addresses two specific literature gaps:

1. I provide a spatial analysis of attitudes from nature parks to spaces outside nature settings (i.e. urban regions). *Space is fluid*.
2. My research provides a *critical non-speciesist analysis* of research areas that often fail to include an anti-oppressive framework on non-human animals.
3. Emphasis on *unlearning privilege* (human and race).

A significant amount of the research understanding attitudes and representations is space specific to an urban setting, nature park, or rural location. When researchers are sensitive to how attitudes towards wolves change across space, they associate the shift with population increases in new wolf areas (Houston et al 2010, Karlsson and Sjostrom 2007, Williams et al 2002, Zimmermann et al 2001). I understand these shifts in spatial attitudes as much more complex and contradictory (complexities and contradictions that are expressed in the phenomenon of violent love [see below]).

My thesis fills this gap through understanding *space as fluid*. My analysis reveals how colonial relations are enacted in different spaces, producing ideas of inclusion and exclusion. Within these spaces is a continuum of love and hate that is influenced by exposure, distance, and socially constructed ideas of belonging. In their analysis of attitudes towards wolves, Figari and Skogen (2011), Karlsson and Sjostrom (2007), Kellert, Black, Rush and Bath (1995), Williams, Ericsson and Heberlein (2002), and Zimmermann, Wabakken and Dotterer (2001) analyze distance in static terms. However, I view distance in more complex terms.

Urban city dwellers express more positive attitudes towards wolves as a result of their lack of exposure, according to Kellert (1985), Kellert, Black, Rush and Bath (1995), and Williams, Ericsson and Heberlein (2002). However, the socially constructed boundaries of urban areas (human spaces) and nature areas (animal spaces) have become blurred that affect positive or negative attitudes. In **Chapter Six**, I highlight a few recent examples of wildlife ‘removal’ in urban spaces. These examples demonstrate how distance, exposure and visibility of predator species in ‘human’ communities shape attitudes from love, to hate. On the other hand, nature parks are fantasy spaces that are constructed as places of animal belonging, whereby humans can love animals in these spaces. However, habituated bears are often constructed as a pest in nature parks, as a result of the distance to humans being described as a threat to public safety (**Chapter Four**). My research suggests that distance is a significant variable that determines love or hate for predator species across all spaces. When the distance is shortened to what is perceived as the ‘wilderness experience’ my research suggests many park visitors feel differently encountering wildlife or experiencing Indigenous people/culture than they would in an urban context.

My project examines what I refer to as ‘violent love’ (borrowed term from Brian Luke 1998 as discussed in the **Introduction**, yet I employ a different context) defined as the loving or hating of wildlife and Indigenous people/culture simultaneously depending on the spatial location and in different contexts inside nature parks. My thesis makes a unique contribution since this specific phenomenon has been inadequately studied. While Wakeham (2008) examined the conflation of Indigeneity and animality, my project understands this conflation in *non-speciesist terms*. I examine the violent love phenomenon as a result of their shared colonial experience and continued perceived threat status to White western progress; I believe these must

be understood and challenged together rather than privileging one groups' oppression over the other.

Cronin (2011) and Francis (1997) identified contradictions in Canadian national identity. My thesis contributes to the understanding of these contradictions through spatial analysis of nature parks and urban life and an examination of literal and figurative power produced by the Canadian wilderness mythology. Further, my sociological research conducted at Algonquin Provincial Park and Bruce Peninsula National Park, supplements the material that is focused on Western Canada.

**Chapter One** has outlined previous research relevant to my study and noted gaps that my project fills. **Chapter Two** discusses and justifies my research methodologies.

## Chapter Two: Methodology

In **Chapter Two** I discuss the importance of qualitative research for this research area, describe my sources of data and my methods of data analysis, explain my rationale for choosing participant observation and critical discourse analysis (CDA) methodologies, discuss my sampling selections, and outline some of the themes and variables.

### *Qualitative Research*

This thesis is an exploratory study that employed a qualitative research design to gain a deeper understanding of the contradictions of Canadian constructions of the wilderness ideal. Spaces of investigation are Algonquin Provincial Park, Bruce Peninsula National Park and Toronto (GTA) to provide a spatial analysis of violent love. Narrowing the research to specific places provides concrete evidence of the contradictory behaviours and attitudes associated with the Canadian wilderness identity. Exploratory research is useful in order to investigate an unexplored research area. Qualitative studies provide a deeper understanding of social phenomena with the aim of answering questions on complex aspects of the social world. Qualitative methods provide the tools to articulate personal experiences and subjective realities. In quantitative research; detailed experiences, identity-making and the fluidity of relationships are often fragmented, whereby social concerns are often reduced to numbers or statistics. This process is problematic when a researcher is attempting to gain insight into a complex social phenomenon (Wolfer 2007).

My research project undertakes a cross-sectional approach to study two specific nature park areas in comparison to an urban setting (GTA). These spaces were selected due to the relevance to my study. Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are the largest and most utilized nature parks closest in proximity to Toronto, the most populated urban city in Canada. My project employs first-hand observation and a critical discourse analysis of social artifacts (park literature

and pamphlets), park exhibits, and websites/media documents regarding wildlife and Indigenous people in urban/non-nature spaces (GTA). Photos collected from Algonquin Provincial Park and Bruce Peninsula National Park are used as a research aid to provide a ‘glimpse’ of the nature park experience. The photos are not used as data, but rather as supplementary evidence of the phenomena I am explaining. The role of the photographs is to support my methods. I did not intend for them to serve as the key aspect, rather my goal was to bring readers with me to the Park spaces.

Social artifact data reveal important information reported by the Parks that exemplifies many contradictions (i.e., violent love). Analyzing websites and media documents provides data on experiences, representations and attitudes towards wildlife and Indigenous people in non-nature spaces. My participant observation account enriches the photos’ ability to explain the complex relationships of ‘violent love’.

### *Sources of Data and Methods of Data Analysis*

My data sources include a) social artifacts (park literature, pamphlets/brochures/newspapers) and park exhibits (gift shops and visitor centers), and b) websites, literature on wildlife and media documents regarding wildlife and Indigenous people in urban/non-nature spaces (GTA). Additionally, I discuss/analyze my personal observations (self-reflection), while visiting the Parks. The above sources of data provided a rich context to analyze the contradictions of simultaneously loving and hating wildlife and Indigenous people. Moreover, I evaluated these contradictions by using the concept of space in a critical way. Thus while my research is exploratory and based on preliminary investigation that seeks to understand this social phenomenon through analysis and observation of space rather than adopting qualitative research methods involving interaction with human subjects, it nonetheless provides a

rich context by recording observations, analyzing media documents and collecting social artifacts.

I felt that interviews, focus groups or surveys would be less useful since firstly, my project is analyzing space and the representations of wildlife and Indigenous people/culture in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula as reflective of widespread attitudes. Moreover, my project explores contradictions connected to the Canadian wilderness ideal that is entrenched in our Canadian identity, which I contend is most noticeable in the sharp differences across space from an urban (non-nature) setting to a manufactured nature environment. Further, collecting social artifacts is a more feasible approach for a MA time-frame. Additionally, surveys would have also encountered challenges since people that visit the nature Parks are most likely on a vacation and may not wish to participate in a research project as this could be perceived as a hindrance towards their tourist or wilderness experience.

Social artifacts and spatial observation are valuable for the purpose of my MA thesis in order to gain insight on the complex relationships and representations across space. Other strengths are the flexibility and exploratory design that allowed me to move freely through the selected space of study and become more immersed rather than wedded to a specific research structure. Further, access to nature parks is uncomplicated since these are public spaces. Analyzing social artifacts and personal observation of items, animals and landscapes in a natural setting provided a rich research context. This research approach provided a deeper understanding through direct participation and immersion in the natural place that is being investigated.

Qualitative methods of data analysis including: critical discourse analysis (CDA) and participant observation are utilized in order to deconstruct the nature park fantasy experience with the intention to explain how representations/relationships with wildlife and Indigenous



people are constantly transforming across space. Adopting a mixed methods approach of two different methods of data analysis has resulted in a rich amount of data to analyze contradictions.

### *Participant Observation*

Buch and Staller (2001) argue participant observation is useful for researching questions “about social and cultural practices of groups of people” (187). Further, they suggest participant observation is an appropriate research method for researchers exploring another ‘world’, one that is a different experience from their everyday, and that it is effective for research projects that are exploring a little-known community. My MA project explores a different ‘world’, one that is different physically in landscape and occupied by different people, as well as non-human animals that would not be seen habitually in an urban setting.

Buch and Staller (2001) report participant observation to include the ‘self’ in the research process in order to create an inter-subjective relationship with participants, as well as approach research holistically to gain insight into individuals’ everyday lived experiences. While my MA project aim was not to understand the everyday directly, relationships and attitudes that operate in different spaces are shaped through everyday experiences and interactions. Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are places of tourism to rejuvenate and escape the pressures and anxieties of modern living (Baker 2002). Furthermore, nature parks become fantasy spaces whereby people, cultures, and wildlife that may be feared or viewed negatively in an urban setting become romanticized and fetishized in a nature park where there is a level of containment.

The inclusion of the self and personal reflection of experiences is important for my thesis. This personal narrative provides context for the experience of travelling through time and space from that of ‘civilization’ to a place constructed as primitive and ‘other’ that allows an individual to romanticize their tourist experience, including the same animals, people and items that might

be viewed very differently in a non-nature setting. Furthermore, the inclusion of personal experience is essential to my thesis since I am a representative from the community of study.

This personal account includes my childhood image of what Francis (1992) refers to as the socially constructed ‘imaginary Indian’. On the one hand, growing up in a mainly White suburban community and encountering the fantasy of the ‘Indian’ in textbooks that is entrenched in the educational system shapes an understanding of Indigenous people that is radically different from lived realities on reserves, whose inhabitants have been spatially removed from my everyday experience. Also as a child I experienced nature and routinely engaged in camping trips enjoying and admiring wildlife; however, as I grew older there was a socially learned fear that emerged towards the wilderness, until years ago when I reconnected with nature. Additionally, I am a representative from the community of study as I live in an urban setting that has recently experienced struggles to coexist with wildlife. On the other hand, the community of Burlington, Ontario is heavily attached to the northern identity and the practice of ‘going up north’ on vacation in the summer months, specifically to the Muskoka region where Algonquin Provincial Park is located and Bruce Peninsula National Park located in Tobermory, Ontario. Lastly, I occupy a position of privilege as a White member of the White settler society.

My project utilizes aspects of participant observation including reporting personal lived experiences and reflexivity concerning privileges. I conducted observation accounts by note-taking while visiting the Parks, as well as engaging in self-reflexivity concerning experiences discussed in this thesis. The rationale for adopting participant observation is an attempt to provide insight on the nature park fantasy experience from a personal narrative representing the community of study. A personal narrative of experiences while visiting nature parks aids in rendering visible the contradictions that exist when park representation is juxtaposed to

reactions, values, attitudes and representations of wildlife and Indigenous people in an urban/non-nature context. Strengths of this method include: self-reflexivity and flexibility.

### *Critical Discourse Analysis*

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is an interdisciplinary tool that seeks to understand “relations between power, dominance, social inequality and the position of the discourse analyst in such social relationships” (Van Dijk 1993: 249). It is a valuable methodological tool to study complex social issues so as to understand a social phenomenon with the intended goal of political action. While it is predominately used to analyze written text, this method can also be used to investigate symbols, visual images and body language as a means of discourse (Fairclough 2010, McGregor 2003).

This thesis utilizes CDA to investigate a) the social artifacts collected at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula in order to explore contradictions, power relations, Park management practices, and representation of animals and Indigenous people/culture; and b) literature on wildlife and media documents regarding wildlife and Indigenous people in urban/non-nature spaces. The principles of CDA provide analytic tools to investigate how text and images (park literature) construct knowledge about wildlife and Indigenous people. These narratives of representation in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula influence ideologies, values and attitudes towards wildlife and Indigenous people in nature park spaces and are exported to non-nature spaces. Also, the principles of CDA are employed to analyze recent stories in the media on Indigenous people in non-nature spaces and urban wildlife exterminations. I selected relevant media stories on the Idle No More Movement and reviewed public debate online about pipeline projects in Canada. I also selected a few recent media stories on predator animals (coyotes and bears) entering urban areas in the GTA. I selected these examples for the following reasons: firstly, they are both

contemporary examples in the media at the time of writing; secondly, the selected examples/stories are highly relevant to the contents of my thesis that highlight urban conflicts between Indigenous/non-Indigenous and non-human animals/humans that appear to be spatially organized and; thirdly, the stories are accessible public documents that provide enough information for the needs of my project. Moreover, this method enhances my ability to explore and reveal the opaque relationships that “secure power and hegemony”, in addition to the dialectical relationship of “how institutions and discourses shape us”, as well as our agency in shaping it (Fairclough 2002 as cited in McGregor 2003: 3).

The analytical steps that were undertaken to conduct a CDA were to first view artifacts, exhibits, shops, and media stories *casually*. Second, analyze *critically*. Huckin (1997) suggests CDA researchers analyze 1. text, 2. discursive practices, and 3. larger social context. To expand on the analytical steps taken in my study, I analyzed as a whole and then deconstructed to understand the whole. I evaluated the interests of text-producers, for example park producers and media outlets. I was attentive to histories, for example the Group of Seven erasing the historical presence of Indigenous people at Algonquin Park. My analysis was highly sensitive to any omissions, for example the omission at the Algonquin Logging Museum of how Indigenous people were living in what is now Algonquin Park 5,000 years ago to the museum skipping to the mid 1800s when they magically vanished from the landscape. I also utilized CDA framing techniques to understand how different media outlets constructed coyotes, bears and Indigenous people/issues.

My method of participant observation and CDA often overlap in my data analysis. While I was at the Parks collecting social artifacts and recording observations I was also critically analyzing any signs of institutional racism and speciesism being enacted in Algonquin and Bruce

Peninsula. CDA principles were also applied to understanding my observations that I recorded during my wilderness experiences. My entire investigation was driven by my goal to analyze texts, interactions and symbols in order to understand contradictions. Fairclough (2010) suggests analyzing discourse is representative of social life. CDA principles were also applied to my sample of media outlets to analyze GTA/urban life representation. Other steps of action I took following a CDA methodology were to be vigilant to what is missing or silenced when I was visiting the Parks, analyzing text and the media stories. A central goal of my project was to promote positive change through advocacy of education and unlearning privileges. The transformation of critical to positive is a key aspect of following a CDA method (Fairclough 2002).

The rationale for employing a critical discourse analysis is grounded in the critical attention this methodology offers to the deconstruction of power at the institutional level, as well as encouraging evaluation of the agency of others in reproducing relations of power. Moreover, another strength of CDA is that the method is designed as a political project that offers an opportunity to reveal a social phenomenon that has been hidden or is opaque to the casual observer. Principles of critical discourse analysis are critical of the researcher's own position of privilege and power that is significant when investigating power relations. I adopted CDA methods to analyze park literature and media documents/websites instead of a content analysis since the latter is more interested in themes and patterns than addressing power relations embodied in discourses.

### *Sampling*

I employed a non-probability sample utilizing purposive sampling techniques for both Park selection and media outlets. Wolfer (2007) argues non-probability sampling is a common

approach to field research in cases where the research is exploratory and in situations when it is not possible, or too challenging to financial and time constraints to conduct probability sampling. More specifically, purposive sampling was selected as this approach is most reasonable, feasible and realistic in terms of the time-frame to answer my research questions. Wolfer (2007) reports purposive sampling is appropriate “when researchers want to focus on specific cases for further in-depth examination” (209). Wolfer’s criterion is met with my research study. My MA project is a case study of two Ontario nature parks and also provides some examples of representation in urban/non-nature spaces (GTA). This research study was also designed as an exploratory investigation with the aim to offer opportunities for more extensive future research.

I visited Algonquin for a three day, two night duration and Bruce Peninsula for two days and one night. More time was spent at Algonquin, since this Park is much larger therefore requiring more time to explore. The time spent at both Parks was sufficient in order to collect social artifacts and explore the Park exhibits. I chose these Parks based on personal experiences and knowledge from acquaintances of the suitability. Due to geographical proximity Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula were more feasible for my study than other large nature parks that create a ‘wilderness’ experience. Also, I knew that these spaces could provide evidence that would aid in addressing my research objectives. Inside the nature Parks I analyzed spaces/representation, elicited information and took photos as a form of memory aid in order to examine gift shops, visitor centers (exhibits of wildlife and Indigenous culture), art museums; as well I engaged in trail hikes and other recreational activities that provided a narrative of the ‘tourist wilderness’ experience.

My justification for selecting these Parks is that they are contaminated with a history of colonization against nature, non-human animals, and Indigenous people. For example, in terms

of non-human animals we may consider wolves as particularly important in symbolic and narrative terms. Wolf eradication programs were widespread projects executed across Canada and the United States as a result of socially constructed fears of wolves as murderous predators that kill for pleasure and pose danger to human populations, while on the contrary wolf protectors have reported the probability of being attacked by a wolf is extremely low (Jones 2002). Algonquin is celebrated as a wolf reserve that has a sizeable population residing there, which is one reason I choose to study this specific Park. While I focus significantly on wolves in my study, I also examine the social construction of bears in the Park gift shops and I analyze reactions to a bear who entered an urban area in Burlington, Ontario. My purpose for including some discussion on bears is to highlight how other feared predator species are represented.

Indigenous people have long endured colonization in Canada, have been coerced to reserves and are subject to increased and invasive forms of state regulation in comparison to their White counterparts (Bracken, Deane and Morrisette 2009, Francis 1992, Spence 1999). However, at these Park sites Indigenous culture is a dominant theme for the tourist to experience, which is aligned with the mythical story of embracing Indigenous culture as part of Canadian nationalism (Francis 1997). While some individuals may argue there is a genuine effort to increase appreciation for Indigenous culture, my research reveals it is the way they are represented that is problematic. Moreover, their culture is commodified as part of the ‘nature experience’ and Indigenous people are continually presented in nature parks as a disappearing population that normalizes the White violence that led to their decrease in population. I reveal that commodified images and cultural items of Indigenous cultures are heavily entrenched into both Parks and there is an opportunity of ‘contact’ between the tourist and Indigenous people at Bruce Peninsula, as a result of the close proximity to a reserve. In my analysis, I show how

nature parks are spaces that aid in alleviating guilt from historical shame over colonization. Further, nature parks are spaces that secure and affirm White identities human dominance over non-human animals and nature.

Nature landscapes are transformed into a commodity and spectacle for leisure and recreational pursuit (Cronin 2011, Hermer 2002). The landscape is showcased as a space of natural beauty that firstly, naturalizes the degradation of nature outside of the park and secondly, assumes park nature is natural, whereas Cronin (2011) argues that this is a social construction and manufactured presentation of nature. The violence embodied within the parks and social relations developed between the tourist and the spectacle are dehistoricized and presented as natural (Cronin 2011, Francis 1997, Wakeham 2008). Moreover, this information has provided the motivation to situate my MA project within a nature park comparative study in order to analyze Canadians contradictions with the wilderness ideal.

The visitor centers provided a deeper understanding of how wildlife and Indigenous people/culture are represented. Further, studying gift shops at the Parks provided context on the commodity relationships between the tourist and spectacles being gazed at. Lastly, participating in important activities unique to each Park allowed me to gain a personal experience of the ‘wilderness’ fantasy.

The rationale for purposive sampling is grounded in the feasibility in terms of location and relevance to my research objectives. Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula both share a colonial history towards Indigenous people that continues to reproduce images inside the Park similar to those described in Daniel Francis’s (1992) ‘imaginary Indian’. Also, they are occupied by a variety of animals including top predators such as bears, wolves and coyotes, in addition to generating high levels of tourism celebrating the wilderness Canadian identity. These ideas are



important to analyze in order to juxtapose the sharp differences in relationships, attitudes, values and representations from a government regulated nature space to one of 'modern' values and urban living.

Non-probability sampling utilizing the technique of purposive sampling was also administered in order to select media stories on urban wildlife in the GTA and on the Idle No More movement. My selection of these examples was due to relevance to my research questions and the convenience of these events taking place during the time of researching and writing. First, I conducted a Google search on urban wildlife cases in different cities in the GTA. When selecting my samples I was attentive to my choice to select stories from different media networks in order to eliminate bias, since different media groups have different political agendas and will therefore attract a specific audience with a certain set of beliefs. Some of the outlets I selected for urban wildlife cases include CBC News Toronto, the Star, CP 24, CTV News, City News Toronto, and the Hamilton Spectator. Some of the media outlets I selected to analyze Idle No More movement and the pipeline project were CBC News Canada, the National Post, the Globe and Mail online, the Financial Post, and CBC Hamilton.

While there were many different media stories on urban wildlife I chose the cases on predator species as my sample since predator animals are the focus of my study. My sample selection of two different urban coyotes was to highlight the importance of distance shaping public attitudes. The Burlington bear case was selected to show readers that other predator species are also feared. I chose media stories on the Idle No More movement as my sample to demonstrate urban city attitudes, since at the time of writing this was a major event taking place involving Indigenous people that were highly relevant to my project. Media stories on the pipeline project were reported in order to demonstrate the contradiction this project poses to the

environment and to Indigenous communities. The selected media stories were my sample since they contributed to the project in a meaningful way. As mentioned above, this sampling technique is the most appropriate for my study. Strengths of purposive sampling are the reasonable financial costs, as well as time effectiveness for a MA thesis. Further, this approach to sampling is highly flexible and non-rigid in structure (Wolfer 2007).

### *Variables and Themes*

My project explores many themes and contradictions within the two selected nature Parks that contribute to my understanding of violent love relationships. In terms of themes I first addressed any spatial contradictions. Secondly, I examined commodity relationships, ‘taxidermic’ representation and any evidence of the conflation of Indigeneity and animality/wildlife. Thirdly, I investigated representation in urban/non-nature spaces through my analysis of urban wildlife and the Idle No More Movement. Lastly, I provide a discussion on space that explains my analysis on violent love.

Analyzing the spaces of Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula through assessment of social artifacts and participant observation (self reflection) provides a rich examination of violent love that operates within the Parks. The conflation of Indigeneity and animality is a useful site to understand the violent love thesis. Indigenous culture is appropriated in nature Parks, just as wild animals are romanticized and gazed upon, while at the same time fur items that involve the death of wildlife are sold at Parks. My observations reveal that many of these same Park visitors identify as nature and animal ‘lovers’. Further, the violence wildlife and Indigenous people suffer outside the Park perimeters is often ignored.

Importantly I devoted critical attention towards the representation of Indigenous people/culture and wildlife in terms of their commodity transformation, as taxidermic specimens

in the visitor centers and in terms of how information is produced about them inside nature Park spaces. Canadian identity is a theme that I analyzed in order to understand how the wilderness ideal incorporates wildlife, Indigenous people/culture and nature in essential combination that allows tourists to experience the wilderness nature park fantasy. Lastly, my project explored the different relationships and attitudes expressed towards wildlife and Indigenous people through a comparative lens between the Parks and in different spaces within each Park.

My thesis reveals the operation of the wilderness ideal located in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula and contributes to an understanding of how violent love is expressed in Canada. I have further compared this to urban/non-nature representations. Canadian identity is conflicted, since the wilderness ideal is a fantasy space that does not match everyday experience since approximately 80% of Canadians live in urban space (as reported in the Living with Wildlife Conference 2012). By exploring these contradictions, I explain how the same individual can simultaneously love or hate someone in different spaces. Thus, my case study analysis reveals some of the complexities and contradictions of Canadian national identity. Attitudes and behaviours are often in disjuncture in terms of what non-Indigenous people claim they believe in, and in identity-making that includes pride of loving the wilderness, wildlife and upholding respect for the nation's first people, which is an ideology often expressed to distinguish ourselves in relation to other nations (Francis 1992, 1997).

Trustworthiness was cautiously considered at all stages of the research process. This is demonstrated through my adoption of anti-oppressive methodologies. The research design of my project was highly sensitive to the need for critical methodologies that would promote researcher reflexivity to privileges. Further, my research has been analyzed and written with careful consideration to my priority to develop non-speciesist knowledge.

Shenton (2004) provides a detailed criterion of the four aspects that constitute trustworthiness: credibility, dependability, transferability, and confirmability. Credibility is ensured through researcher reflexivity. More specifically, reflecting on my own position as a researcher and beneficiary of White and human privilege, I provide thick descriptions, adopt a mixed methods approach, reflexive commentary, “examination of previous research findings”, as well as comparing different nature parks and visiting a variety of places within the Parks to strengthen accuracy of my project’s arguments (Shenton 2004:69). Strengths of credibility employed from Shenton’s (2004) criteria are that it provides an anti-oppressive approach that improves accuracy of the data.

Dependability was built into my research design and is delivered through comparing two different nature parks in the same province. Further, as reported by Shenton (2004) triangulation through ‘overlapping methods’ is an important consideration to enhance dependability. My project adopts a mixed methods approach; including participant observation (self-reflection) and a critical discourse analysis (CDA).

Transferability is achieved through my attempt to formulate the results to be transferable to other nature park studies and to researchers analyzing attitudes/representations towards wildlife and Indigenous populations across space in different parts of Canada. A limitation is that different nature parks throughout Canada may represent wildlife and Indigenous people in different ways. Further, while colonialism and wolf eradication are not unique violent practices to Canada, the circumstances may vary in different countries. My MA thesis has attempted to understand specifically the contradictory relationships, attitudes and representations Canadians hold towards wildlife and Indigenous people that are built into the Canadian wilderness national

identity, which may be challenging under dependability principles to “be applied to other situations” (Shenton 2004: 69).

Confirmability is achieved through Shenton’s (2004) recommendations of triangulation (i.e., mixed methods) to reduce the effect of investigator bias. Important considerations to enhance confirmability are demonstrated through reporting limitations and shortcomings of the thesis, as well as researcher reflexivity. While qualitative research must be approached with a significant amount of sensitivity, reflection of privilege and power through careful measures and following the steps Shenton (2004) suggests that trustworthiness can be enhanced and therefore generate knowledge of important social phenomenon.

#### Chapter Summary

**Chapter Two** has provided the rationale and justification for adopting participant observation (self-reflection) and critical discourse analysis (CDA) methodologies. I discussed in detail why these methods are the most fruitful for this research project. I also explain my sample choice: Algonquin Provincial Park, Bruce Peninsula National Park, media outlets, and outline the different data sources I examined. An important consideration throughout this research is to maintain an anti-oppressive framework, in this chapter I demonstrated my commitment by discussing my motivations for the critical methods I employed. **Chapter Three** explains the theoretical influences: *spatial theory* and *animal geography* that guided my research.

## **Chapter Three: Theoretical Framework**

**Chapter Three** explains the theoretical influences that have guided my research. First I discuss spatial theory and then second, animal geography. Here, I provide details on the significance of these theoretical frameworks as theories and on their relevance to my project. I also outline different concepts and ideas I have borrowed from the theories for my thesis. Lastly, I highlight the strengths and limitations of each theory in order to explain why two different theories were required in order to examine the violent love phenomenon.

### *Discussion*

Research was guided by two theoretical perspectives that aimed to demonstrate the complexity and contradictory relationships that are assigned to non-human animals, Indigenous people and nature according to the spatial context. My project incorporated a geographical and White settler lens that both address concerns of space and the importance this has on identity attachment to landscapes, attitudes towards wildlife and Indigenous people, as well as the justified oppression of marginalized groups (species and humans alike) in order for the dominant group to exercise their privileges. An intersectional analysis that analyzed different spaces and groups required an interdisciplinary approach that theorized multiple dimensions of a macro sociological phenomenon exploring contradictions of the Canadian wilderness identity.

The transformation of relationships with wolves and with Indigenous people requires investigation. They have historically been and continue to be treated with immense hatred in some spaces, in addition to similarly experiencing state sanctioned programs that aim to regulate and control these populations through direct extermination for wolves' and assimilation policies for Indigenous people (Coleman 2004, Emel 1998, Jones 2002, Spence 1999). Moreover, the intentions were for both Indigenous and wolf populations to be eliminated (Emel 1998, Lopez 1978, Ward 1997). Further, in an urban landscape they remain feared as well as stigmatized,

whereby many people express negative perceptions of them that justifies their containment and in some cases direct violence for the case of wolves, or intense state surveillance resulting in the over-incarceration of Indigenous people despite their low population rate within Canada in comparison to the White population (Loo 2006, Lopez 1978, Smandycn, Lincoln and Wilson 1993). Moreover, analyzing the ambivalence and conflation of wildlife and Indigenous people requires a dialectical approach that rejects dualisms.

### *Spatial Theory*

*Spatial theory* is a theoretical framework I utilized in order to understand the sociology of space, the meanings embodied in places and spaces, as well as the identities that are created and affirmed across space. Razack (2002) argues that a spatial analysis can aid in revealing the “operation of all the systems” of domination “as they mutually constitute each other” (6). Theories on space view oppression as interlocking, whereby all spaces are situated within a context that is highly racialized, classed, and gendered. Moreover, no space is natural and this analytical view of the social world allows sociologists to understand how humans and spaces interact, as well as what meanings are attached to spaces.

Razack argues space is organized to sustain and manufacture unequal social relations and my research reveals that these inequalities are continually reinforced through the normalization of who belongs in specific spaces. Moreover, the study of space is a sociological and geographical inquiry that was useful for my investigation of spatial attitudes and representations of ‘love’ or ‘hatred’. Razack’s (2002) conception of space involves ‘unmapping’ the spatial significance of racialized violence in Canada in the context of a White settler society. Furthermore, her intersectional approach is highly sensitive to the dispossession of Indigenous people in Canada and she is also acutely aware of the significance of Canada’s national mythology as a spatial

vision of ‘pristine wilderness’ and a place of empty land prior to Europeans arrival that naturalizes positions of dominance and marginalization (Razack 2002).

The rationale for employing Razack’s (2002) theoretical insight on space is that her explanations are relevant to how I understand the significance of domination and the White settler society as something that is reproduced. Further, her analysis provides a useful vocabulary to articulate my concerns of the conflation of Indigeneity and animality, as well as enhances my theoretical approach that views space as racialized similarly to Razack’s (2002) arguments and I also show that space is speciesist. Space influences social attitudes that shape social practices, which transform and travel across spaces from ‘civilization,’ a place of respectability associated with Whiteness to a place of ‘primitiveness,’ the untamed wilderness occupied by what has been socially constructed as the savage ‘other’ including predator animals and Indigenous people. Moreover, nature parks become a fantasy space for tourists, since these spaces are a radically different landscape than their everyday life. In nature park spaces tourists can evaluate their personal or national ‘progress’ and reaffirm their dominant position either unconsciously through purchasing commodities or outside parks can participate in the mastery over what is deemed ‘other’ including Indigenous people, wildlife and nature. Razack’s (2002) spatial analysis also includes critiques of the symbolic relationships of space. Finally, spatial conflict is a dominant theme in my thesis and Razack describes the Canadian national identity of wilderness as a White space that allows ‘White national governors’ the role to manage Indigenous bodies and wildlife constituted as a threat to the White colonial project, requiring spatial containment and intense regulation (Emel 1998, Hage 2000, Razack 2002, Wakeham 2008).



### *Animal Geography*

An *Animal Geography* theoretical framework is a critical approach to understanding human-animal relationships that views space as a tool to exclude, segregate and “manage social difference,” whereby animals are critical to the making of landscapes and agents to the “constitution of space and place” (Wolch and Emel 1998: xiv, xiii). This approach transcends singular specific social injustices and instead utilizes a multi-dimensional framework in order to understand the complex relationships and interactions between non-human animals and humans. Further, there is a consideration of the shifts in attitudes across spaces between nature and society that shape one another and are viewed as inseparable (Wolch and Emel 1998). An animal geography lens maintains a focus on animals across spaces through a geographical and cultural lens; however, it is also sensitive to and reflexive of race, gender, and power, in addition to critiquing notions of progress, modernity, and identities attached to humans in different spaces (Wolch and Emel 1998).

Wolch and Emel (1998) argue space is a contributor to shaping human relationships with animals, social practices and cultural attitudes that continually reconstitute one another. The framework considers the complex entanglement of place, space, and landscape between humans and animals that evaluates these concerns through investigation of animal subjects and human identities, coexistence in borderland communities, political economy of animal bodies, in addition to animal and moral landscapes (Wolch and Emel 1998). This approach is progressive in terms of envisioning social change through education and behavioural modification, in order for humans to learn how to coexist peacefully with non-human animals (Wolch and Emel 1998). Moreover, animal geography is a political project that challenges the social forces that create landscapes and examines the continuous struggles humans and animals experience over space (Wolch and Emel 1998). This approach challenges speciesist theories that often exclude the

consideration of non-human animals and also is inclusive of geography, as well as a spatial analysis. Further, animal geography recognizes that cultural attitudes are a significant driving force that deems animals as being ‘out of place’ in an urban city, justifying their segregation and containment to a depleted nature landscape. Animal geography rejects the claims that animals are indispensable to human interests and instead views each species alike caught in the “splendor and travail of the earth” (Beston 1928:19-20, Wolch and Emel 1998).

The rationale for employing an animal geography theoretical framework is the multi-dimensional approach to understanding human-animal relationships across space. Further, there is an emphasis on identity and meaning attached to landscapes, as well as places that was useful for my project in order to analyze different attitudes and representations established from nature park settings to an urban city. Wolch and Emel (1998) provide a language to communicate struggles over space between animals and humans in ‘borderland communities’ that are defined as places where animals and humans are expected to share space and as a result conflict arises. This concept is relevant to my examination of space sharing struggles in an urban setting in comparison to valued relationships with animals in ‘wilderness’ spaces.

Colonialism is also included in the theoretical approach, more specifically what Wolch and Emel call the ‘colonial rule’ over animal bodies and Indigenous people who have been racialized as ‘other’ taking on ‘savage’ qualities similar to wild animals of the Canadian wilderness. Understanding colonial relations is one of my main goals of this project (both within the Parks and outside Parks in urban areas across GTA). Urban identities are relational ones that demonize the rural and wild areas, constructing them as places that are ‘primitive,’ requiring management and White control. Lastly, animal geography understands animals are constructed (my research shows Indigenous people too) as ‘out of place’ in an urban landscape that requires

their containment and segregation as their visibility threatens ideals of White human progress (Brownlow 2000, Coleman 2004, Wolch and Emel 1998).

### *Strengths and Limitations*

Spatial theory and animal geography both were employed since they together eliminate weaknesses of one another that focus too much on race in spatial theory and animals in animal geography. However, similarly they investigate the importance of space and identity that humans, more specifically White individuals attach to landscapes and spaces that influence their relationships and attitudes towards wildlife and Indigenous people who have historically and continue to be controlled by 'colonial rule' (Razack 2002, Wolch and Emel 1998). The theoretical frameworks I employed are similar in the sense that they understand power as complex and entangled that aim to explore space through investigating meanings attached to places and explain how cultural attitudes, as well as social practices are shaped by these meanings. Finally, both theoretical approaches understand control of bodies in spaces as a consequence of being labelled 'out of place' in certain landscapes. My research reveals the perception of not belonging, justifies an individual's removal (wildlife) or containment (Indigenous people) to a nature park or reserve that contains their association of the untamed wilderness. Moreover, in a nature park setting, wildlife and Indigenous culture is romanticized in order to produce the wilderness fantasy. This fantasy permits animals and people/cultures that would be feared or viewed negatively to be eroticized, transformed into commodities and gazed upon, while visitors leave unmarked to journey home to spaces of 'civilization'.

### *Violent Love*

Brain Luke's concept of violent love is borrowed for my research project to discuss the contradictory relationship of loving and hating someone simultaneously. As mentioned in the introduction, Luke's (1998) analysis focuses on hunters and masculinity. He argues many

hunters experience a matrix of emotions during the experience of killing (hunting) wild animals. Many hunters express a high degree of love for the animals they kill in the wild (Luke 1998). However, this expression of 'love' is tinged with violence and death that is contradictory to their emotions of 'love'. Hence, an appropriate term, 'violent love' was coined by Luke (1998) in order to describe this phenomenon.

Luke's concept is central to my analysis and his language of 'violent love' is employed within my research in order to explain complex contradictions Canadians experience. My adoption of violent love is unique in many ways. Rather than only focusing on hunters and animals, I apply this framework to understand the love-hate relationships Canadians experience with the wilderness identity (including animals, Indigenous people and nature). Luke's (1998) concept is a significant idea that guided my research in terms of understanding the complex contradictions people experience when thinking about their relationships with colonial wild bodies. I apply violent love to understanding contradictory relationships within Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula, as well as to understanding the violent love that operates outside park spaces in the GTA when I analyze media stories on urban wildlife and the Idle No More movement.

## Chapter Summary

**Chapter Three** provided justification for my theoretical framework. I highlighted the importance of theories that analyze space in order to reveal power and contradictions that operate across space (violent love). I discussed how these theories contribute important insights and concepts that provide guiding principles for my research. I also discuss a key concept 'violent love' that I examine within the thesis, borrowed from Brian Luke (1998). Finally, there is a dialogue about why both theories are required, which highlights the importance of a need for more research that understands colonialism and oppression through a non-speciesist lens.

**Chapter Four** is **Part One** of the beginning of my data analysis, where I discuss my research findings on the *Invisibility of Exploitation* at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula through my analysis of contradictions within these spaces.

## PART ONE

### Chapter Four: The ‘Wilderness’ Experience: *Invisibility of Exploitation*

Wilderness... is a state of mind (Nash, 2001: vii).

This chapter is the **First** of **Two** chapters that specifically analyze the violent love relationship and master narrative of the nature park experience of Algonquin Provincial Park and Bruce Peninsula National Park. This chapter addresses one of my research questions: to what extent is the violent love phenomenon a dominant theme in representations and experiences of nature parks?

I discuss the many spatial contradictions that operate in nature park boundaries, such as the extractive activities that take place within the ‘protected’ Park; for example: hunting, fishing, and logging are permitted in parts of Algonquin. I also analyze what is absent in the representation of the two nature Parks (historically and contemporarily); critique the narrative of rescue and the overarching individualist message to Park visitors to self-govern. This chapter next includes a discussion of how violent love needs to be understood in the context of capitalism and concludes with a critique of the Algonquin Logging Museum.

#### **Mythical Dualisms of Space and Spatial Conflicts of Parks Use**

One of the main purposes of this research is to investigate spatial relations in order to examine contradictions within Canadian national identity, particularly involving the romanticization of wilderness, wildlife and Indigenous culture. More specifically, I address the question of how individuals can love or hate wildlife and Indigenous people/culture depending on the spatial location, from a ‘manufactured’ wilderness space to an urban community. My analysis reveals the complexity of the violent love phenomenon and I discuss how it operates

within my two selected nature Parks. I show how violent love is a set of complex relationships individuals express as a result of ideas of spatial belonging, distance and concealment of violent practices.

As noted in the literature review section, there are continuous academic debates concerning the nature-culture divide (Cronin 2011, Thorpe 2012). This is important work, since the illusion of spatial divisions and invisible boundaries informs constructions of belonging or exclusion, constructions that are revealed in my research. Further, spatial constructions of ‘wilderness’ and city naturalize the capitalist agendas of park-making. Thorpe (2012) finds the construction of ‘wilderness’ problematic, since this fantasy erases the original human inhabitants of the area, various Indigenous groups that continue to struggle for land claims. Here, it is essential to incorporate Baker’s argument that “wilderness has a history” and that ‘nature’ “is a consequence of social production” (Baker 2002:199). Wilderness spaces are portrayed as ‘virgin’, a term that, Thorpe argues, firstly feminizes the land and perpetuates fantasies of empty space that ignores the presence of Indigenous people of Temagami, historically and contemporarily (Thorpe 2012). Nature spaces are depicted in photos as pristine places that do not suffer from ecological damage. Cronin (2011) disrupts this myth in her work on “manufacturing national park nature”, reporting the degradation from tourism and the consequences that the illusion of a culture-nature divide has on ‘nature’. Furthermore, socially constructed definitions of spatial containment of ‘nature’ deny non-human life as active agents inhabiting the land that will be impacted by nature park tourism. Our social world has been constructed on the basis of dualisms that create and reinforce ideas of belonging that ultimately shape attitudes and practices of discipline. Baker’s notion that “wilderness has a history” must be front and center when

critiquing nature parks: this allows us to understand who is absent and which narratives are heard, while others are silenced.

Both Parks under investigation in this research have been shaped by historic and contemporary spatial conflicts. These conflicts can be discerned in some key texts that serve to construct the Park's identity, such as Park literature and exhibits, report that Indigenous people resided in and utilized the space prior to the invasion by White settlers. Importantly, I observed that neither Park reports the transfer of land from Indigenous people to the government. This is not surprising, since according to Ishay (2008) and Wakeham (2008) much of the narration of history often dehistoricizes the violence perpetrated towards victimized groups, especially the Indigenous people who suffer from the continuous project to make them disappear physically and symbolically in texts for White readers. The erasure of Indigenous people is a part of the dominant narrative in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. Paradoxically, Indigenous culture is simultaneously celebrated and transformed into commodities and historical specimens, just as Indigenous people are erased as real individuals. This narrative of disappearance is one that is typically applied to Indigenous communities (Francis 1992, Wakeham 2008). Framing Indigenous people as a 'dying' population fails to acknowledge that Indigenous people currently occupy (i.e., live in) spaces in or near Algonquin Provincial Park and Bruce Peninsula National Park.

Another area of conflict concerns wildlife in these spaces including: their use to benefit humans (exploitative or financial gain), intrinsic value and discipline both historically and contemporarily. To clarify, when I refer to discipline I define this phenomenon as the surveillance, control and deliberate extermination of Indigenous people and non-human animals. Both Parks use space differently and represent wildlife and Indigenous people in ways that are



broadly similar, yet with some significant differences. The way the Parks are used and activities that are permitted and prohibited often conflict and contradict with one another in terms of what many Park visitors may expect from nature spaces.

### **Contradictions inside the Nature Parks**

Nature and society are everywhere implicated in one another (Thorpe 2012: xii).

Critical examination exposes seemingly-endless contradictions. To begin, Algonquin contains multiple contradictions in terms of the promise to deliver the wilderness experience to tourists. While there is a strict spatial division between the nature Parks and ‘outside’ or neighbouring communities, spatial restrictions and allowances determine specific activities in concentrated spaces and locations within the Park. Algonquin does not claim in the literature it produces that the entire Park is protected (including species, land and resources). Indeed, the Park is subjected to a number of extractive practices.

#### *Logging in Nature Parks*

Analysis of the Park’s history in the literature produced by the Park in partnership with the Friends of Algonquin Park revealed a contention. Logging was a primary reason behind the initial decision for the government to protect the space in 1893, thereafter named Algonquin Provincial Park (in 1913, previously a national park): the goal was to preserve a steady supply of a vital resource, timber (Algonquin Website: Cultural History). Algonquin does not conceal the knowledge that logging takes place within its boundaries. Instead the industry is showcased as a spectacle, since the Park has created a logging museum that intends to educate visitors about the history of the logging industry in what was constructed as Algonquin Provincial Park land (ignoring First Nations land claims), as well as justifying and reporting current logging practices of ‘sustainability’.

A common site for visitors to Algonquin is a regular flow of trucks, loaded with logs, traveling down Highway 60, the major road that lets visitors travel from the west gate to the east gate (the entire length of the Park). The important question is: where is the logging taking place? Park managers have carefully concealed logging practices to ensure that ‘selective’ cutting operations do not cripple the ‘wilderness’ experience for the numerous tourists who travel to the Park for this singular reason. Concealment is achieved by relegating logging to specific areas of the Algonquin landscape that are defined as non-tourist areas. Thus, wilderness is managed. Indeed, ‘wilderness’ is a loaded term that many scholars consider problematic (Baker 2002, Cronin 2012, Hermer 2002, Thorpe 2012). Baker (2002) says Algonquin distinguishes itself from other Ontario parks by offering what ostensibly is a space of ‘wilderness’ where individuals “can experience nature in a more or less primordial state” (198). Algonquin presents the landscape as ‘natural’, but in fact it is “the appearance of things” that is presented as natural (Baker 2002: 198). Using the case of Temagami Forest, Thorpe (2012) argues that power is secured through the naturalization of social relations and White control of ‘threatening’ populations.

The naturalization of logging inside Algonquin and Temagami serves to obscure capitalist goals and nation-building agendas to secure and exploit Canada’s natural resources. In Algonquin, the literal activity of logging is concealed, yet the practices of logging are naturalized. The naturalization narrative of logging and other exploitative practices, including environmental degradation within what Thorpe (2012) refers to as ‘national spaces’ (wilderness parks) is a repetitive theme found from my analysis. Logging in a socially constructed ‘wilderness’ space is a sharp contradiction that is worthy of critique, since the Park continuously attempts to justify logging while simultaneously naturalizing the space as wilderness. It may be

suggested that this arrangement is acceptable since exploitation is out of sight and provides jobs and a steady flow of an important natural resource; however, despite the appearance of positive outcomes of logging (such as protection of the space), nature is being exploited for humans. The normalization of logging to satisfy human desires reproduces beliefs that humans are the managers of the land, while non-human species/life are inferior, expendable and commodifiable. Further, concealing the practices of logging allows individuals to more easily justify the exploitation of nature, a process that can result in unintended consequences.

### *Hunting/Trapping Wildlife in 'Protected' Spaces and Invisible Boundaries*

Another contradiction within Algonquin and, in this case, Bruce Peninsula as well, is that contrary to popular belief that mammals, amphibians/reptiles and fish are protected in these spaces, in reality there are many challenges and restrictions to the *protection narrative fantasy* of nature parks. The protection ideology is a fantasy because this over-simplifies conflicts over how parks should be used and ignores capitalist demands on government to allocate the land for economic motives (such as logging, tourism or producing scientific knowledge for human benefit).

Algonquin has produced a lengthy pamphlet called "*Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park*" (2002) that provides important information about different species (mammals) that reside in the Park. Firstly, the Park portrays itself as a rescuer of disappearing populations from many other regions of Ontario and in Canada. Algonquin reports that an important "role of the Park" is to serve as a refuge (5). Specific mention is made to the "wolf, bear, marten and fisher" who are suggested to be "mostly gone" from "now agricultural southern Ontario", as a consequence of habitat destruction and "uncontrolled harvesting from humans" (5). The language utilized by the knowledge producers of Algonquin constructs a rescue role narrative. Here, I wish to clarify that

when I critique the *rescue narrative* of these Parks I do not dispute the important role they play in preserving sensitive waters, landscapes, restoring species populations, and featuring Indigenous culture as the first people of Canada (and the Park spaces themselves). Instead I am critiquing what the rescue narrative is concealing, producing, and reinforcing and how naturalizing narratives of disappearance function to obscure unequal power relations.

The *Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park* (2002) pamphlet presents success stories of preserving wolves, beavers, martens, and fishers. In addition the term ‘Park’ invites the common conception among the general public and Park visitors that the mammals inside “Algonquin are completely protected”; however “this is only partly true because there is both hunting and trapping in parts of the Park” (5). More specifically, hunting and trapping are permitted on Algonquin’s boundaries by the Golden Lake ‘Indian’ Band and the Clyde and Bruton Townships. The Golden Lake Band was granted hunting access in the eastern region of the Park in 1958 and in 1991 was given permission to hunt in an overlapping area of Algonquin during the months of mid-October to mid-January. Clyde and Bruton Townships are granted access because these communities were only added to the Algonquin territory in 1961 and were already established hunting and trapping areas. This information is shocking to learn for many people, including myself. Yet, many visitors likely will not receive this information, since the Park does not advertise this widely. While visitors are not required to know the hunting exceptions and regulations at Algonquin (unless the visitor is a hunter), there is an expectation that hunting is prohibited in what many tourists believe is a protected space (provincial park). Hunting/trapping wildlife exceptions in spaces tourists have defined as a place of wildlife belonging is a contradiction to the wilderness experience. People interested in obtaining this information would need to actively search for the answers that can be found in the pamphlet on *Mammals of*

*Algonquin Provincial Park* (2002). Park visitors may be confused, since throughout the Park there are signs and information that indicates individuals are not permitted to hunt, trap, or remove wildlife.

As a consequence of this controlled and concealed knowledge, the myth of full protection of Park species remains intact, manifested in romantic ideas about the activities that take place within ‘wilderness’ spaces. I suggest that the protection myth is a standard practice of parks. While many mammals are protected in provincial and national parks in Canada, these spaces also border hunting regions and animals do not understand these invisible boundaries. The significance of this contradiction of protected wildlife and hunted/trapped wildlife in park boundaries is that it reveals a spatial conflict in terms of ideas of belonging and how knowledge is circulated and managed to advance tourist fantasies of what is socially constructed as ‘wilderness’. There is a widespread and entrenched belief that wildlife is protected within Park boundaries (*Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park* 2002). This knowledge disrupts the ‘wilderness’ fantasy that is one of the most significant justifications for people to visit nature spaces, such as Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula.

It is important to mention that the contradiction involving protection versus hunting/trapping is not the only spatial contradiction involving wildlife at Algonquin. The Park’s boundaries are invisible and of course non-human animals cannot be expected to understand these restrictions that can ultimately result in their own persecution. The illusory nature of boundaries is revealed by the fact that wolves move around. Wolves during periods when deer are scarce inside the Park will leave to find deer in townships just outside the boundary of the Park (*Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park* 2002). Theberge’s research provided important findings that reported radio-collared Algonquin wolves were being killed by humans outside the

Park. In fact information in the *Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park* (2002) pamphlet reports “from 1988-1993, an average of 24% of 16-22 radio-collared Park animals” were killed by local residents and in two seasons the number were closer to 40-50% of the Algonquin wolf population (25). As a result, the Ontario government developed a ban on killing wolves in three townships suggested to contain high numbers of deer during the winter season (December-March), in order to avoid killing the Algonquin wolves (*Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park* 2002). This is clearly problematic and demonstrates complications of spatial boundaries; including the enforcement and policing of those boundaries. Also, the surveillance of Algonquin wolves is an example of how violent love operates across space. While on the one hand, advocates and defenders of Algonquin wolves devote high levels of energy to protecting them inside the Park, what happens to wolves who do not reside in Algonquin? This question will be explored in **Chapter Six** (urban wildlife reactions).

### *Fishing and Speciesism*

Another contradiction within Algonquin is fishing, particularly the process of protecting some fish and eating other fishes’ bodies. Firstly, fishing in Algonquin is naturalized as part of the ‘wilderness’ experience and the killing and consumption of fish is normalized, that is, rooted in speciesist ideologies. Cronin (2011) is acutely aware of the consequences that the practice of fishing has for the fish themselves, rather than from an ecological standpoint. She argues “fishing is described in terms of the enjoyment of human participants, rarely is mention made of the non-human animals so central to this sport” (89). Cronin (2011) suggests some reasons why fish are treated as a source of recreational activity is that they are “neither of nature nor of wildlife” and their entire existence is constructed in park promotional material to be “an aid to experiencing the park through recreational pursuit” (89). I, similar to Cronin (2011), observed that in

Algonquin literature fish are only referred to in the context of sport fishing. Cronin (2011) suggests this phenomenon is a consequence of how fish are constructed in reference to recreation, whereas wildlife (bears, wolves, chipmunks, beavers, etc) are themselves walking tourist attractions, meaning that they have intrinsic worth within the Park boundaries and therefore are protected from hunting and trapping (although, as noted above, there are exceptions to this rule in Algonquin).

Further contradictions exist concerning the protection of animals in park spaces. For example, Cronin (2011) notes that fishing is legal in Jasper Park, whereas hunting is prohibited, even though as she points out, both sports result in the death of non-human species. An important question is how is fishing any different than hunting? According to common definitions, hunting is the process of seeking out and killing wild animals for food or sport. This is precisely what fishing is, except fish are not classified as animals and as a result they are awarded less protection. This is a common contradiction; many nature park advocates may be greatly concerned about protecting wildlife (i.e. mammals), yet this protection is often not extended to fish and other important occupants of the lakes and rivers inside Park spaces. Cronin's analysis of how different animal species are constructed in park literature offers important insight on how these ideas shape attitudes and therefore affect the treatment of certain species within nature park spaces. Building on Cronin's analysis of wildlife as tourist attractions, my analysis reveals that socially constructed meanings of species and increased viewing opportunities of wildlife in nature parks, means that land-based animals are granted more protection (not full protection) in places such as Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. However, fish live in water below the land level of humans and are rarely seen 'up-close' in the water; thus, their value in tourism is only appreciated if they are 'caught'. Further, it has been documented that people sympathize more

with warm-blooded fur-bearing animals (Herzog 2010). Such social constructions of animals are reflected in the fact that, there appears to be more literature on mammals within Algonquin. Furthermore Park literature on mammals is more descriptive of their social behaviours in comparison to information produced about reptiles, amphibians and fish, which is more scientific.

While live-release catching is suggested as an option in the Park's *Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013*, much of the information there invites fishers to enjoy "a shore lunch-there are few things more satisfying than cooking and eating your fresh catch" (*Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013*:14). This suggestion exemplifies human privilege and violent love; Park visitors love the experience of fishing that results in the violent act of killing and consuming an individual fish. Fish are highly undervalued on the species hierarchy and are not granted a high level of moral consideration (Regan 2004). Even some self-identifying 'vegetarians' consume fish bodies, suggesting assumptions that they do not suffer like mammals who share more human attributes (Herzog 2010).

The *Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013*'s suggestion that "it never hurts to live-release a fish so that someone else can have the pleasure of catching a fish on their visit" reconfirms Cronin's (2011) arguments that fish in nature parks are only referred to in the context of recreational sport. Live-release practices fail to acknowledge the inhumane treatment this inflicts on individual fish, even if they are thrown back into the water and their flesh is not consumed. Sentience in fish is now accepted in the scientific community, and it has been reported that fish do endure painful sensations that are not simply reflexes (Braithwaite 2010). Other academics and scientists have reported important findings, suggesting that fish can socially learn to avoid pain (Mercy for Animals: Skinned Alive). It seems clear that placing a hook into



any being (human or non-human) is barbaric; such treatment would cause outrage if perpetrated on a human and treating other mammals in this way probably would be unacceptable to many people. However, for fish individual agency is not taken into consideration, since their existence is perceived in terms of consumption for food and as a form of tourism offered by the Park for visitors. The way different species are constructed in Park literature significantly shapes ideas about species that thereafter affects human interactions and relations with them.

Fishing restriction and possession guidelines in Algonquin is an example of spatial contradictions. As mentioned, fishing is legal and an encouraged activity within the Park to satisfy individual human 'wilderness' fantasy experiences. Yet, there are possession limits and restrictions on what fish species can be 'harvested'. This is an attempt by Park managers to control populations and fulfill their role as '*national governors*' of the forest and lakes to ensure there are not 'too many' or 'not enough' individuals of other species present. Techniques of population management are applied to humans as well, especially in relations to concerns about race. For example, Hage (2000) refers to 'getting the mix right' in the context of Australia's immigration policy and growing fears among Anglo-Saxon populations of an influx of other ethnicities in what is considered a White nation. Hage is critical of the idea of 'too many' and the role this plays among national governors. A somewhat similar framework of 'getting the mix right' can be applied to the idea of Algonquin as a manager of fish populations. Algonquin managers not only govern populations of fish, they control spaces of belonging and exclusion for fish species. There is a spatial contradiction here similar to my abovementioned example of wolves who are disciplined in neighbouring areas of the Algonquin boundary. According to the *Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013*, "there are seven fish sanctuaries in Algonquin Park that are closed to fishing at all times", as well as no fishing at water control

dams (35). Establishing select spaces for fish protection is a strange Park rule and highlights spatial contradictions. Fishing is permitted everywhere else in the Park, as reported on the Algonquin Park Website, including over 1,500 lakes and 1,200 kilometres of rivers and streams. Another interesting observation is that of all the fined offences at Algonquin, fishing in a sanctuary is the most costly (a total of \$305 in comparison to “disturb, kill, remove, harm, harass animal” for a fine of \$190) (*Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013*: 35). This information is fascinating since there is a much more vocal narrative of protecting wildlife (mammals) within the Park, yet the fine for killing any wildlife is less than fishing in a fish sanctuary.

There is a spatial contradiction, whereby some fish are ‘loved’ (protected from killing and consumption), while the majority of fish are at risk for tourist recreation and consumption. Moreover, some of the same fish species are ‘loved’ or ‘hated’ in the same space of Algonquin depending on the lake they reside in (sanctuary or open to fishing lake). There is also an emphasis on keeping out ‘invasive’ species in order to eliminate the disruption of the ecosystem of each unique waterway. Worms are an example of an invasive species to Algonquin (*Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013*). The *Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013* suggests to anglers who “have bait worms remaining from your trip, throw them in the trash, not on the ground”, since they have been identified as non-native to Algonquin their existence in the Park space is classified as not belonging (14). Further, their lives are assumed to be insignificant; disposing of them in the trash to either slowly suffocate or starve demonstrates another layer of speciesism, whereby fish trump worms. The notion of invasive implies that a species does not belong in a specific space. This terminology is routinely used by Algonquin and serves to create categories of belonging (Indigenous) or exclusion.

There is also an individualist narrative entrenched within fishing restrictions and rules at Algonquin. In the *Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013* this theme is explicitly identified: “the AFAU (Algonquin Fisheries Assessment Unit) has been relying on the co-operation and good will of anglers to provide information on their efforts and trout catches” (15). This statement suggests there is an expectation of self-responsibility to report all catches in Algonquin territory and that all individuals should want to participate in this.

### *Contradictions of Meat eating and ‘Going up North’*

What is camping without the experience of sitting by a campfire and roasting some hotdogs and burgers? It is assumed that such items will be popular features of the menu when individuals are camping or enjoying the cottage life. Growing up in Ontario, situated as a White middle-class individual, I have always been exposed to the cottage/camping lifestyle that is entrenched in Canadian culture. A popular conception among Canadians is the summer dream of hiking through a rugged terrain that ends with a gathering at sunset to roast some meat over a campfire.

Canadian identity is strongly linked with meat eating. Canadian identity is directly linked to wilderness ideologies in which the wilderness experience celebrates consuming meat products. Meat consumption is inseparable from the Canadian ‘wilderness’ experience. In Algonquin’s portage shop there are food items for sale that specifically are marketed products of “the Great Canadian Meat Company”, such as a beef jerky snack (Figure 1). The shop also sells convenient travel- friendly meat cooking tools, such as the camp fork used to cook hot dogs or sausages, allowing Park ‘explorers’ the ability to cook ‘primitively’ by using a fire safely (Figure 2). The restaurant at the shop presents particular meat items as Canadian. For example, specific items are advertized as ‘Canadian’; including the “Canadian Back Bacon on a Bun” described as: “a very

Canadian way to start your day” (Figure 3). While there are some vegetarian options at the Portage restaurant and a salad option at the restaurant inside the visitor center, the dominant food choices are meat products and there are hardly any vegan options. While it is true that vegan options are scarce in eating places outside parks, I found this more concerning in spaces that advocate wildlife protection. The species hierarchy is demonstrated in these spaces by the fact that cows, pigs and chickens are consumed, while many other animals (i.e. bears) are valued as non-human animals possessing intrinsic worth. At Bruce Peninsula there were similarly minimal vegetarian/vegan options at the local restaurants and there is a dominant narrative of meat consumption, however there is less association of meat with Canadianness in comparison to Algonquin.

Another example of meat eating as synonymous with the wilderness experience was reported by a portage tour guide. A popular event at Algonquin is partaking in a canoeing excursion and unskilled nature tourists can pay to take a tour with a skilled guide. For the purpose of this research project, I decided it would be useful to participate in a guided canoe experience in order to observe the guide’s narrative and learn more about how Park employees presented the Park space and experience. During the tour, the guide informed visitors of the importance of strength when portaging in Algonquin’s backcountry. He further reported that he admired wildlife immensely and was studying ecology at university. The guide also reported personal wildlife encounters including a moment of direct contact with a wolf, describing this story romantically; it was obvious by the way he told his story that this was a powerful moment for him. Further, he informed canoe tourists the best way to end a day in the ‘bush’ was to grill up a steak and crack open a bottle of whiskey. This observation again underscores the linkage of masculinity, meat, wilderness, and violent love.

The guide's admiration of wolves in Algonquin and consumption of farm animal flesh demonstrates the sharp differences in attitudes between 'wild' and 'domesticated' animals. Anderson (2004) explores important historical and cultural differences between wild and domesticated animals that are important in order to understand the species hierarchy demonstrated in my above example. Historically, domestication of animals by colonists was an attempt to impose European order in the New World through the domination and control of animals (Anderson 2004). The domestication of animals was celebrated as European progress and evidence of modifying a landscape (Anderson 2004). An important cultural attitude adopted by colonists was that domesticated animals (livestock) are different than wild animals because domesticated animals are property (Anderson 2004). The property status of domesticated animals is linked to domination principles of religion and economic agendas of capitalism (Anderson 2004, Torres 2007). These varying attitudes between wild and domesticated animals are important to analyze, since they reveal the colonial ideologies that are attached to specific animals that continue to operate contemporarily.

Meat is and always has been consumed by people with power (Adams 2010). Adams (2010) identifies meat eating as a male activity, suggesting that this is a result of the construction of meat as a masculine food that she argues is embedded within class distinctions. Meat is heavily associated with masculinity, power and domination over others according to Adams (2010). She argues there is a widespread belief that animal protein is required for strength, masculinity and more specifically she suggests notions of meat protein are entangled in a "hierarchy of race, class, and sex" and species (53). This belief is widespread within western culture and has expanded in scope with the acceleration of globalization (Adams 2010, Campbell and Campbell 2006). Thorpe (2012) argues 'wilderness' spaces are places that are feminized,

often these spaces are described as virgin territories. However, the feminization of nature is often contradictory as the wilderness is routinely masculinized as dangerous by hunters' in order to amplify their hunting prowess (Kalof, Fitzgerald and Baralt 2004, Luke 1998). Thorpe suggests the feminization of wilderness is entrenched in a narrative of domination and is a national space to be conquered by White men. Thus, the consumption of meat in a wilderness context is heavily laden with symbolic associations of gender and power. For example, the association of meat protein and masculinity is heavily promoted in a wilderness setting, since the protein myth produces ideas of meat and strength.

In rugged spaces, such as Algonquin (more so than Bruce Peninsula which is described as a semi-wilderness experience), a narrative of strength becomes a repetitive theme. Canoeing and the portage experience are heavily linked to ideas of strength and masculinity. In the *Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013* and other texts produced by the Park, canoeing and portaging are often depicted as rigorous activities that require the skills of men. Many of the images of canoeing at Algonquin display men, more specifically White men canoeing. Images such as these produce relations of dominance and belonging based on gender and race hierarchies. If there is a woman in the image she is often canoeing with a man, reinforcing women's subservient position to men within and outside the Park perimeter. The masculine conquering of nature is a theme that has been explored by numerous scholars. Luke (1998), (2007) examines the exploitation of animals and nature, and argues that conquering non-human species is a practice of masculinity. Collard and Contrucci (1989) and Thorpe (2012) argue while nature is feminized, wilderness spaces are constructed as places for male belonging and male domination over earth's inhabitants. As a result of the social construction of wilderness as a space of male belonging, women are viewed as 'out of place'. Therefore, when women are

represented in Algonquin literature they are often with a male, as a result of socially constructed perceptions that men belong in wilderness spaces.

A prominent theme within Algonquin Park that is highly visible in the *Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013* is the danger adventure narrative. Baker (2002) also reports that Algonquin pamphlets and canoe route maps provide “descriptions of Park experiences” as a “reading strategy-coded as adventure” (201). This ‘adventure’ theme is significant to ideas of masculinity and strength since this narrative is naturalized as a male experience. My experience as a woman at Algonquin was that portaging is a dangerous and rigorous activity that requires male assistance in order to overcome the untamed wilderness. Adventure is a male socialized form of expression and females who engage in these adventures may be viewed as a ‘tomboy’ for transgressing traditional gender role stereotypes. While there are some ‘girls can do it too stories’, such as the recent auto-biography; *Wild: From Lost to found on the Pacific Crest Trail*, in which Cheryl Strayed described her successful hike of over 1100 miles on a solo quest, these women are viewed as the exception. Women who participate in these challenging wilderness quests are constructed as heroines, while males are much more likely to be expected to undertake a wilderness excursion that is shaped by gendered social constructions.

The portage experience is a highly masculinized activity drawing upon the social construction of wilderness as a feminized landscape to be conquered and consumed by men. Further, the danger adventure narrative inscribed in wilderness spaces is associated with maleness. These excursions require individuals to carry their own canoe over their head on land to water as Park visitors travel their desired route, a rigorous battle constructed as a masculine task. While I suggest that male participation in a portage trip is normalized, I do not suggest that

women are intentionally excluded. Rather, portage trips are constructed as dangerous and the understanding that women may be deterred from engaging in these wilderness holidays without the assistance of a man reinforces a dependency relationship.

Meat consumption in all spaces is normalized; however, in wilderness spaces it is promoted as essential to provide the strength necessary to undertake physical activities. Vegans, who reject all consumption of animal products, are familiar with the commonly asked question: where do you get your protein from? Many individuals link the absence of animal protein with physical and emotional weakness. Adams (2010) suggests meat is a “symbol and celebration of male dominance” linked to the perceived value meat holds as an economic commodity, thereby those who control the commodity achieve higher levels of power (58). Adam’s arguments are important since capitalist relations of meat-eating are embedded with gender and species inequalities and are also connected to ideas of nation and contribute to identity-making.

Here, I provide an example from outside the two Parks’ in order to illustrate the widespread connection of wilderness with meat-eating. In *Canadian Geographic Travel’s* Go North edition there is a romantic advertisement for people to visit Alaska (Spring 2013). There is an association between wilderness, nation, masculinity, and meat-eating exemplified in this advertisement: “Alaska is known for its rugged wilderness and history of gold seekers...take in mountain vistas on a two-hour trail ride that includes a hearty campfire lunch of roasted hot dogs and marshmallows” (*Canadian Geographic Travel: Spring 2013*:21). This advertisement constructs a masculinized Alaska described as a rugged wilderness (requiring strength and stamina), using associations with a history of gold seekers, essentially a history of colonial conquest that was widely undertaken by males.



Another example of meat-eating in the ‘wilderness’ is associated with Algonquin Park’s February 2013 “Winter in the Wild Festival”. The itinerary mentions a campfire and BBQ that would serve hot dogs, beef and veggie burgers. While the Park’s attempt to offer a non-meat option to visitors is commendable, the serving of animal bodies as food at a nature park remains a contradiction. Many people who travel to these spaces do so to enjoy nature and animals, yet the normalization of meat consumption in these spaces highlights contradictory relationships that are entangled in a matrix of power and domination. Meat production leads to more environmental degradation than any other activity, including the automobile industry (Sorenson 2010:167). The contradiction here consists of loving nature, while simultaneously participating in acts of environmental devastation. In fact, such devastation may account in some degree-for why nature parks hold such a significant meaning, since they symbolize disappearing spaces, ones that Canadians have identified as significant to our history and important to our national identity. While many Park visitors admire the wildlife that resides within Algonquin, the majority of these same people participate in meat-eating practices, thus contributing to the destruction of such places and such wildlife. Gary Francione (2000) would call this an act of moral schizophrenia, a condition that he describes as a set of “confused and incoherent ideas about animals” (Sorenson 2010:10). It is important to mention that the term moral schizophrenia has been critiqued as promoting oppressive language and therefore I refer to this simply as moral inconsistency.

### *Wilderness/Nature Tourism and Wildlife/Environmental Preservation*

We humans have been, and still are, very much in the picture (*Booth’s Rock Trail*).

Many people assume wilderness/nature spaces are places that are protected environmentally. Contrary to popular belief, these spaces have and continue to suffer environmental degradation from non-park environmentally destructive activities, as well as from

activities that take place within the Park. While global climate change affects all environments, including spaces constructed as 'wild', what is less consciously acknowledged by Park visitors is the environmental destruction that occurs within nature parks as a result of tourism. Hermer (2002) argues "Parks are a site of environmental destruction" and a place of what he refers to as 'emparked nature' (103). He identifies an important contradiction that he calls '*regulated exploitation*,' to describe the process of protecting and consuming something simultaneously. More specifically, he argues "preservation then depends upon its exploitation" (Hermer 2002: 104).

To simplify, Hermer essentially argues that parks are socially constructed protected spaces and this same motivation to preserve the space encourages tourists to visit and utilize the protected park in order to enjoy a spectacle associated with 'difference' from the everyday. This spectacle could involve, as Hermer suggests, a landscape, or wildlife but also, my research reveals, Indigenous people/culture. Cronin (2011) makes a similar argument suggesting that tourist photography has positive and negative impacts on Jasper National Park. She explains that the same systems of ideas that promote healthy ecosystems in order to attract tourists to travel to 'pristine' (perception) landscapes with goals of photographing spectacular romanticized spaces, also contribute to the degradation of the populated tourist area inside a park (Cronin 2011). Cronin also dissects the capitalist agendas at work at Jasper, suggesting "it makes economic sense for tourist destinations to maintain at least the appearance of ecological integrity" (65). While the capitalist agendas of parks are often invisible, Cronin argues that the economic benefits of parks are masked in perceptions of preservation and protection. The preservation of spaces such as Jasper promotes domestic and international tourism that results in capital generated for business and government. Thus it is important to consider the profits generated by

the tourist industry when analyzing nature park spaces, regardless of the fact that Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula appear to adopt a rescue role and display romantic images of their desire to protect wildlife and the environment.

Cronin's work also provides useful evidence that can be used to support Hermer's idea of regulated exploitation. Tourism plays a role in destroying species and results in land destruction; however, there is a contradiction because without tourism many parks would not exist (Cronin 2011). Therefore, while tourism has radically altered the landscape and affected the lives of animal and plant species, many species likely would have disappeared if tourism had not been promoted (Cronin 2011). Economic motivations of parks must be evaluated, since in a capitalist society nothing can exist for an intrinsic reason outside of human interest and benefits. Park spaces have been created for human profit (tourism/some parks logging), recreation, enjoyment, and entertainment, thus what has been preserved and protected is no accident. Everything in nature parks is a product of social relations of non-Indigenous humans (Whites) against nature, wildlife, and Indigenous populations.

The term nature or wilderness park itself is a contradiction, since this idea perpetuates the myth of a culture-nature divide. The process of simultaneously preserving and consuming within nature parks is an example of violent love at both Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. As I mentioned above, logging in Algonquin can be understood as an activity of regulated exploitation, since this was the primary reason that Algonquin initially was designated as a protected Park. While logging led to the preservation of the Park initially, it also involves cutting trees and may also result in the destruction and non-intentional death of wildlife whose habitat has been destroyed and are exposed to predators or harsh weather. Hage's concept of 'getting the mix right' is applied in logging practices, as park forestry managers are perpetually engaged in

selective-cutting, which includes only cutting weaker and older trees in an attempt to limit disruption of the Algonquin forest. However, my personal experiences and consumption of knowledge at Park exhibits reveal that many people assume Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are natural and frozen snapshots of an earlier period of history. On the contrary, both the forests are relatively young, as reported in the visitor centers. While both Parks use the language of nature and wilderness in order to promote tourism, they both also reveal that they have undergone fundamental environmental changes from the period of early contact with humans and now from high levels of tourism. In the literature guide for the *Booth's Rock Trail: Man and the Algonquin Environment at Algonquin Park*: "We've Remodelled the Old Place" reports:

Many people imagine that upon reaching Algonquin Park, they are entering a completely natural environment. To be sure, the air, water, and forests are far more natural here than in the regions where most of us live. You would be mistaken, however, to think that we humans have not played a major role in shaping today's Algonquin Park. If you wonder what is 'man-made' about the forests of Algonquin you might be astonished by photographs taken here around the turn of the century. They reveal the shrubby aftermath of earlier logging and subsequent uncontrolled forest fires. Indeed, our Park forests are not always the product of thousands of years of natural development. In many cases they are young forests less than a century old and by no means identical to the ones destroyed or modified by man. What is more, virtually every living thing in Algonquin has been affected by these man-caused changes. Some forms of life have disappeared entirely and others are completely new-unknown in the Park before the coming of Europeans (Post 1: We've Remodelled the Old Place in *Booth's Rock Trail Guide*).

My purpose for including this section of the trail guide is to demonstrate how Algonquin describes the Park as a space that has undergone restructuring as a consequence of human activities. While Algonquin narrators reveal that the Park is not as 'natural' as many visitors believe, the language utilized could still be read as perpetuating myths of the culture-nature divide. I read this narration this way for the reasons outlined below. It appears that Algonquin produces what I refer to as a *nature-continuum*. On the one hand, the Park acknowledges the forest is young and has suffered from human inflicted abuses that can no longer be referred to as a 'wilderness' in absolute terms. Yet, the idea the Park is much more natural than where visitors are traveling from contributes to the belief that nature parks do not suffer immense ecological

consequences as a result of tourism. Cronin (2011) demystifies fantasies that national parks are not consumptive ways to experience what has been socially constructed as ‘wilderness’ through dualistic thinking of what nature is “perceived not to be, namely, urban, crowded, polluted, and industrial” (28). While I would not disagree that Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are radically different in many ways than my life in the GTA, the point here is these differences are a result of social relations and upon closer examination these differences may be less polarized. For example, at Algonquin campsites there are large garbage bins for Park visitors to dispose of their waste. Where does the park staff dispose of garbage? Is there a landfill inside the Park perimeter, or is the garbage disposed of outside of the Park space in order to create the appearance the Park is a sanitized landscape? With the high levels of tourism at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula this is clearly problematic and not sustainable.

An interesting observation at Algonquin more so than at Bruce Peninsula was the impact tourism has on wildlife. At developed campsites along Highway 60 the wildlife are tamer in these spaces in comparison to other animals of the same type that would be seen inside the Park. Although the ‘do not feed’ message is repeated within the Park’s literature and newspapers available to visitors/campers, people continue to feed wildlife. Cronin (2011) also notes how Jasper National Park discourages individuals from feeding animals by suggesting, “a fed animal is a dead animal” (122-124). When predator animals become accustomed to being near humans concerns arise, since this clashes with tourist objectives to enjoy a sanitized wilderness experience. Tourists may want to view a bear from a distance but not be directly approached by one or have their campsite raided. In the *Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013* the idea that ‘a fed animal is a dead animal’ (Cronin 2011) is explicitly stated concerning bears:

Bears are normally shy of humans and quickly get out of your way. However, if they've had luck finding food at campsites, some bears lose their fear and start visiting campsites regularly looking for something to eat. These 'habituated' bears can become persistent and become a problem (6).

Problem bears are usually killed since relocating bears has been deemed ineffective by the Park managers, who report relocation success has been limited to none (*Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013*). Therefore, Algonquin managers ask tourists to police their feeding practices in order to eliminate the killing of wildlife who have been constructed as 'problems' warranting discipline. Tourism generates both admiration and discipline. To clarify, I am suggesting that as a consequence of tourism, bears in developed campsites are in more danger of being disciplined (killed) than bears in the backcountry. This is linked to breeches of space with humans. Bears spotted from a distance (canoe) in the backcountry are more likely to generate positive attitudes (love) since they are viewed from a safe place and are in spaces constructed as wild, and are assumed to pose less of a threat. In Algonquin, there are two types of bears: one, the problem habituated bear and two, the wild bear that visitors would want to admire from a distance. This characterization demonstrates the implications tourism has for wildlife. It also highlights the socio-spatial constructions of belonging and exclusion, which thereafter shapes social relations with humans.

While the Parks are imagined as wilderness spaces, a concern in both Parks is overcrowding on trails. I observed this directly when visiting both Parks. At Algonquin this was most evident on Booth Rock Trail and on Canoe Lake. While hiking Booth Rock Trail the presence of so many other visible hikers led to challenges when viewing landscapes. Also, Canoe Lake is a route to the backcountry and overcrowding disrupts the wilderness experience. At Bruce Peninsula, the Grotto and Indian Head Cove trails are incredibly busy. There are so many people who visit this attraction that you almost forget you are supposed to be in a nature setting.

The Explore the Bruce Website suggests to tourists that in order to avoid crowds it is best to visit in the spring or fall.

What I highlight here is a contradiction in the wilderness experience. Although Parks acknowledge that they are not primordial spaces, Park managers strive to “ensure that the ‘feel’ of wilderness is not destroyed” (*Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park 2002*: 10). The presence of large numbers of people contradicts what wilderness has been constructed to mean through photographic images of nature spaces and the tourist industry (Cronin 2011). In reality, while the Parks do not feel the same as an urban city, they do not exactly live-up to the romantic images constructed about wilderness spaces. Creating the ‘feel’ of wilderness can be a challenge in spaces such as Algonquin Park, as noted above in relation to logging and tourism. Algonquin reports that approximately twenty percent of all timber production in southern Ontario is from Algonquin Park (*Booth’s Rock Trail*). This is shocking since Algonquin has a reputation as one of the most rugged and natural terrains left in southern-central Ontario.

What is more fascinating is how Park managers create a wilderness ‘feel’, while simultaneously exploiting the forest for timber. Baker (2002) argues that in order for Algonquin Park to “produce specific touristic experiences, ecological production must coincide with textual production” (200). Therefore, in order for the touristic experience to remain intact, exploitative practices, such as logging require spatial displacement through what Baker (2002) refers to as ‘zoning.’ According to Baker (2002), zoning is a Park initiative to divide the land into either “ecological or recreational categories” including development, historic spaces, nature reserves, recreation areas and places of wilderness (202). Practices of ‘zoning’ and spatial displacement of exploitation allow the visible to be invisible. This happens through the illusionary boundaries of zoning, which allows contradictory activities and values to occur within the same place. While

logging is permitted in areas of the Park and there is what I refer to as a celebratory narrative within Algonquin, the actual practices of logging are removed from what Urry (2002) describes as the ‘*tourist gaze*’ in order to create fantasies of the ‘wilderness’ experience through the *invisibility of exploitation of nature*. This competition of interests is an example of violent love and operates through spatial displacement.

Lemelin (2006) investigates “relationships between photography, the tourist gaze, and ocular consumption” in Churchill, Manitoba also known as the polar bear capital of Canada for tourism (517). His research challenges the idea of non-consumptive recreational activity that is also a dominant theme within Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. This is the idea that recreation does not result in consumption and destruction. While polar bears have become the symbol of climate change consequences, such as the reoccurring image of a polar bear on a tiny chunk of ice, the negative effects of polar bear tourism in Churchill are often invisible through what I call the *recreational non-consumptive myth*. Lemelin (2006) articulates the concerns of high consumption levels in the sensitive space of Churchill, Manitoba that is framed as the ultimate wildlife experience for elitist nature enthusiasts. The space of Churchill has been constructed as exotic for tourists and carries a high price tag in exchange for what Lemelin refers to as photographic trophies.

Polar bear tourism at Churchill is an example of Hermer’s regulation of exploitation and, of violent love. On the one hand the space has been designated as protected for the purpose of tourist consumption, which simultaneously leads to the degradation of the environment that is supposed to be protected. Violent love is exemplified here since individuals are motivated to visit by admiration for a threatened and disappearing population but at the same time participate in environmentally destructive activities that contribute to bears’ extinction. The idea that polar



bears are disappearing may be one reason for individuals to travel to this space. Being able to travel to Churchill is a benefit of class privilege and individuals traveling there can formulate identities of a non-consuming recreationalist, since viewing occurs in what is constructed as a protected nature space. Violent love is demonstrated here since visitors are sympathetic to bears and admire their 'wild' beauty, yet they also contribute to environmentally destructive activities through their touristic experience stemming from their love or desire, as Lemelin suggests, to check this one off their list. This example provides further evidence of how tourism and ideas of protection/preservation that motivate people to visit 'protected' nature spaces also significantly contribute to the destruction of the same species or environment that is designated as protected in the first place. Further, this example highlights how harms/exploitation are not displayed openly, and are instead experienced as admiration for nature that contributes to myth making about 'protected' spaces.

The non-consumptive myth operates within Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula in order to satisfy wilderness and tourist fantasies associated with national identity-making while in these spaces. The *Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013* exhorts visitors, especially backcountry 'explorers', to 'leave no trace', which perpetuates the myth that these socially responsible individuals do not contribute to the alteration of the landscape. While I am not suggesting tourists who visit parks should be vilified for participating in recreation and engaging in the 'Canadian experience', I am arguing, as do Cronin (2011) and Hermer (2002), that the illusion that tourism does not threaten the environment is itself problematic. Through direct observation it became obvious that many people who visit nature parks believe they are environmentalists, and most probably do not think they are contributing to environmentally damaging activities. For example, trails at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula may appear as natural

to visitors, however according to Hermer, Algonquin Park and other nature parks are highly ordered experiences, whereby the experience of “naturalness and freedom of parks” are embraced from practices of regulation (Hermer 2002). To simplify, Hermer is suggesting what is assumed to be natural, such as trail walks are in reality a form of spatial regulation, whereby individuals are guided from a beginning to an endpoint. These individuals imagine themselves as free, while the wilderness experience creates fantasies of releasing the chains from stresses associated with modernity. This argument uses a Foucauldian theoretical framework that provides insights on understanding the social world as a place where people are governed by their perceived freedom that is essential to the nature park experience. While some examples highlighted above are easily concealed from the casual observer and uncritical visitor, one explicit example of violent love is mandatory to include in this research.

Algonquin has a reputation as a wilderness space and a recreationalist’s dream. Many Algonquin visitors, as well as myself, perceive a strong presence of canoe culture within the Park, while this is less dominant at Bruce Peninsula. First, much of Algonquin cannot be explored except by canoe and secondly, the canoe is symbolic of the wilderness and Indigenous populations, thus satisfying fantasies of primitiveness. The automobile symbolizes civilization and cripples the wilderness experience and therefore is used to a limited extent. My analysis reveals that Algonquin in public imagination is synonymous with the canoe experience, evidenced by imagery of Algonquin and the canoe is a common theme inside the gift shop (Figure 4). While visiting the Park on a canoe tour I was shocked to be passed by a speeding motor boat. I asked the tour guide if motor boats were allowed at Algonquin, since this was the first time I had seen one there and to my disbelief he confirmed that some lakes permitted motor boats. In fact as reported in the *Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013* power

boats (“a boat that is propelled by electric, gasoline, or oil power) are not permitted on most Algonquin lakes” however, there are exceptions (14). There are 12 identified lakes where motors are permitted; ten do not allow speed over a 20 horsepower limit and two allow unlimited horsepower. This list is not exhaustive since these are only the motor boat permitted lakes along Highway 60 and “for a detailed list of backcountry lakes where motors are allowed, refer to Canoe Routes of Algonquin Provincial Park” (*Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013*:14). This use of *exception* is common at Algonquin, whereby some animals can be hunted while others are protected, some fish are in sanctuaries, while others are consumed, and some lakes allow motor boats, while others are preserved. Permitting motor boats in at least 12 Algonquin lakes demonstrates not only a contradiction in terms of ‘wilderness’ since motors represent civilization, but is also an example of the non-recreational consumptive myth as motor boats over time result in the destruction of lake’s ecosystems and threaten non-human species. Those who utilize motor boats and likely identify as nature enjoyers are also more obviously (perhaps consciously) participating in the exploitation (pollution and disruption of nature) of the Park in comparison to canoeists. This is a striking example of violent love towards nature.

Another fascinating piece of information delivered by the canoe guide was that the group who passed by on the motor boat was the ‘Roots’ family (Roots the clothing company). The Roots family allegedly created the company as a result of childhood experiences at summer camp Tamakwa at Algonquin Park. The guide reported that the Roots family own property on a private island at the Park and are large supporters and funders of the Park. This information further solidifies my above description of connecting violent love with motor boat participation. The nature loving Roots family owns property and enjoys Algonquin as a result of childhood memories of summer camp, while simultaneously engaging in exploitative practices that alter the

landscape over time. When I asked the guide how the motor boats will affect the lakes, he replied that the lakes are sensitive and there will be irreversible consequences. There was no explanation by the guide and it was not indicated in any of the Algonquin literature produced by Park managers why motor boats are permitted. The eventual disappearance of Algonquin's lakes is normalized and reported sympathetically as if nothing can be done about the exploitation when this is obviously not accurate. Mentalities of '*enjoy it while you can*' appear to pervade the Park, reproducing socio-economic inequalities of who has the privilege to enjoy recreation. Also this ideology is rooted in speciesist understandings that ignore human moral responsibility to consider the lives of non-human species.

### *Capitalism and Master Narrative of Nature Parks*

Whenever humans seek to "manage" nature, creating parks and artificial boundaries, it is always for the benefit of humans (Bekoff 2010: 40).

Critiquing capitalism in the context of nature parks is a complex task and I do not intend to provide a detailed argument here. Instead I highlight some effects of capitalism 'outside' a nature setting and note how this may contribute to decisions to visit nature parks. Secondly, I discuss how social relations within the Parks reproduce capitalist relations. Thirdly, I show how capitalism is connected to nation building in the context of logging and the importance profit has on the maintenance of parks. Not discussing capitalism would be a serious limitation, since capitalism led to the establishment of parks and is a primary motivation for individuals to visit, and capitalist objectives are reproduced and circulate within parks.

Hermer (2002) suggests parks are privileged places that provide treasured childhood memories. Cronin (2011) argues national parks, specifically in the Rocky Mountains in Western Canada are important to Canadian national identity. Visiting provincial or national parks is characterized as an important experience for Canadians to enjoy in their childhood. According to

Hermer (2002), park-like places represent spaces of innocence and freedom that are often associated with experiences of children. Corporations such as Walt Disney and more recently McDonald's routinely exploit ideas pertaining to the 'childhood experience' in order to create intergenerational business (Schlosser 2002). These corporations assume the childhood experience will be exported into adult life and thus create new customers from those individuals bringing their children to recreate previous memories (Schlosser 2002).

Hermer (2002) argues nature park spaces represent a special and sacred space in what he refers to as "an often alienating grown-up world" (xii). Entrenched in capitalism is alienation, whereby individuals view themselves as un-free and coerced into an oppressive existence. Hermer (2002) confirms this narrative of *constrained freedom* in a socially constructed 'free' liberal nation state. Fantasies of freedom are a myth in order to ensure people govern their behaviours and moral conduct that are aligned with capitalist values. Hermer (2002) argues our experiences of freedom are oppressive as they are characterized within a punitive police state. The insidious forces of capitalism are more visible now than in previous decades at a global and domestic level, exemplified by an increase in protest directly challenging capitalism's exploitation and injustices as with the Occupy movement (some call this the un-occupy movement in order to avoid oppressive language against Indigenous people since they are the first people and settler society must un-occupy in order to refrain from reproducing injustice).

During times of turbulence within what is called mainstream society, Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula become spaces of sanctuary from the hustle of everyday urban life. Algonquin explicitly advocates against the use of modern day technologies as much as possible in order to create the 'wilderness' feel for Park visitors. This includes: minimal use of cell phones and limited or no access to electricity at campsites; some campgrounds are 'radio-free', for example

at Mew Lake campground in order to produce the tranquility that Algonquin promises to deliver to its visitors (*Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013*). There is a contradiction when individuals attempt to escape modernity spatially by moving from an urban region to a constructed wilderness space, yet simultaneously desire modern items and benefits of capitalism.

Corporations have managed to enter this wilderness space. For example at the Algonquin Logging Museum there is a pop machine for Pepsi products (Figure 5). Besides the obvious point that Pepsi is a major global corporation and iconic symbol of capitalism, I found it interesting to see that the Pepsi machine has a photograph of the 'wilderness' on it. Not only is a Pepsi machine a contradiction of the wilderness experience, the representation of wilderness on the machine erases the environmentally damaging role corporations have on the environment. In terms of corporations such as Pepsi, this impact is seen only in terms of pop cans discarded as waste. The water footprint for soft drink companies is huge and not sustainable. Ironically many of these companies claim they are committed to environmental sustainability improvements. Additionally, Coca-Cola is well-known for their 'advocacy' of polar bears that sends the message to uncritical populations that this corporation is concerned about animals who are affected by climate change, while the company simultaneously exploits the environment. Unsustainable overconsumption is naturalized. This example further demonstrates the violent love relationship we experience with capitalism. We pretend we do not need luxury items, yet we find ways to include them in all spaces of our lives including wilderness spaces. This suggests many western individuals 'cannot' (or rather, choose not to) live without benefits of capitalism. While on the one hand, individuals may travel to Algonquin or Bruce Peninsula due to experiences or feelings of alienation, or oppression, many of these same individuals are unable to

give up the privileges and benefits of capitalism, while enjoying their sanitized ‘wilderness’ experience. The wilderness experience is not only an exercise of class privilege but also one of race that will be discussed in the **Chapter Five**.

Capitalism is paramount to the making and maintenance of both Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. Nature parks also represent something more intangible, natural capital. Cosgrove (1995) argues the national park movement is an effort to accumulate natural capital in order to create a White nation. Natural capital is a demonstration of a country’s wealth and prestige in a competitive globalized community. A country that is associated with an abundance of natural capital is often represented as a wealthy nation state that has a surplus of natural resources and the financial privilege to maintain untouched nature/wilderness areas. Within a capitalist regime, Canada is attractive internationally for its image as a natural resources reserve and this is reflected in our national identity. Hage (2000) argues “nature is perceived as a national value that needs to be exploited and or saved, depending on how it is classified by the domesticators” (168). The rescue narrative within parks often masks the capitalist agendas attached to preserving ‘wilderness’ areas.

Capitalism operates everywhere within Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. It is fundamental to the narrative of progress. This narrative is best exemplified in the Algonquin Logging Museum. Logging is depicted in the museum pamphlet as a necessary activity in order to build the nation. This is highlighted in the following text from the pamphlet:

If you had been a struggling Ontario or Quebec farmer back in the 1800s, your land might have produced enough to feed and clothe your family but you would have been hard-pressed to earn the cash needed to buy other necessities...one of the few possibilities for extra income was to spend the winter in a logging camp and, at one time, over half the able-bodied men in Canada did just that...In the fall, after you had got in your crops, you would have put a few belongings in a cloth bag, said goodbye to your wife and children, and started the long walk of days or weeks to reach your home and job for the winter (*Algonquin Logging Museum* 2008:Station 1).

This pamphlet constructs a narrative of progress: Canadians once lived in poverty and have evolved to prosperity. First, this assumes quality of life and material position for all Canadians has transformed. Yet, this ignores the reality of life on reserves for Indigenous populations and other marginalized groups that suffer from discrimination and inequality (Balfour and Comack 2006). Secondly, this description could be read as constructing wilderness and its inhabitants as inferior and ‘wilderness’ as an obstacle to overcome in order to progress as an individual and as a nation. Thirdly, there is a narrative of survival and masculinity. This is highlighted in the sentence: say “goodbye to your wife and children.” This masculine perspective reproduces ideas of the wilderness as a rugged terrain that is a male space (Station 1). Also, this description assumes men are the only ones who deserve recognition for building the nation, reproducing ideas that women are inferior. Also, who was removed from the land to build a White nation? Further, entrenched in this caption is the naturalization of the hetero-normative male and nuclear family, linked to capitalist fantasies of reproduction. Fourthly, there is a heroic celebratory narrative of exploitative nation building agendas, such as logging. Discourses on logging represent this activity as essential to Canadians’ prosperity and is a reminder of the Canadian past that serves as a memory piece of ‘how far we have come’ that produces ideas of ‘progress’ and also contributes to Canadian’s national identity as ‘lumberjacks’.

McClintock (1995) argues ‘industrial progress’ and the “project of imperialism” are intimately linked (4). Industrial progress is an overlapping theme within the literature on the *Algonquin Logging Museum* (2008) and is entrenched in the tour at the Park. Ideas of “we’ve come a long way” technologically in logging production are documented by the presentation of knowledge from the past to present, as well as sub-titles included in the tour guide literature (Station 15). The first few posts report a danger narrative of logging that reconfirms as



previously mentioned: ideas of masculinity, wilderness, survival, hero, and nation building. Death is naturalized as part of the collective goal of nation building and obtaining a better life, associated with modernity. The tour guide literature then reports important industrial inventions, such as trading in the horse and other tools for motor operated equipment and the development of the railway, which is exemplified in station 16: “From Muscle Power to Motor Power” (*Algonquin Logging Museum* 2008: Station 16). Dominant themes of industrial progress and development are entrenched in ideas that capitalism is the ‘better way’, which decontextualizes the dehumanizing aspects of capitalism that alienates individuals from their labour.

The last images that Algonquin visitors are presented with at the Logging Museum are two photographs of two different loggers that are juxtaposed in order to naturalize progress through time from six generations ago to present (Figure 6). Progress is constructed firstly through the use of black and White ink in comparison to colour. Secondly, the ‘modern man’ is wearing a hard hat helmet for protection that is a modern invention in comparison to the image of the man from the 1830s wearing a regular hat that offers no protection from dangers associated with logging. Lastly, while the man from the 1830s is depicted as primitive with excessive facial hair, the modern man is clean shaven that mirrors the cleanliness obsessions associated with Whiteness and civilization in the age of what Valverde (2008) calls ‘light, soap and water’, as well as suggesting that modern equipment is more accessible for shaving necessities.

These types of photos contribute to the myths that society is in a perpetual state of improvement, development and progress, a myth challenged by my research. The narrative of progress at the Algonquin Logging Museum reports a sanitized version of logging history, progress, and colonization, exemplified in a slideshow presentation. The slideshow made no

mention of colonization and displacement of Indigenous people from the Algonquin space. Reference to Indigenous people was limited to mentioning that Indigenous populations resided on the land over 5,000 years ago. Representations of the Park as empty when loggers arrived in the 1800s perpetuate myths of empty land and erase a substantial part of the land's history, as well as naturalize the 'disappearance' of Indigenous people. The disappearing myth is more accurately a fantasy (Francis 1992); instead Indigenous people have been spatially contained (Razack 2002).

There is a strong connection between discourses of progress and wider imperial and nationalist goals (McClintock 1995). The Logging Museum is an example of what McClintock refers to as *panoptical time*, whereby "imperial progress is consumed at a glance" (32). When visitors leave the Algonquin Logging Museum and consume the photos of the two loggers, multiple readings are possible. These images are also a celebration of technological advancements. The Algonquin Museum is also an example of McClintock's *anachronistic space*, defined as a prehistoric space that individuals can travel to in order to go back in time to explore the past. The Algonquin Logging Museum is organized as an anachronistic space, since the entire Park itself is a journey of time travel. Finally, the discourse on the Algonquin Logging Museum reads as an example of violent love. Logging is presented as an endless battle against the wilderness in a time of hardship, articulated as something that must be overcome and tamed through industrial technological inventions. Yet there is simultaneously a narrative that shows logging is a part of Canadian history. It is romanticized and glorified as a national celebration. This example has demonstrated the violent love we experience with capitalism. My research on the Algonquin Logging Museum has shown that our experiences of 'progress' are conflicting. One of the motivations people travel to 'wilderness' spaces is to escape pressures from

modernity (capitalism). Yet within the Parks I found that industrial progress is continuously celebrated. Our relationship with capitalism is contradictory, as we often feel alienated yet we are unwilling to give up privileges from capitalism.

The following chapter (**part two**) provides a critical analysis of two specific spaces within Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula, the gift shops and visitor centers/museums. This chapter has attempted to demonstrate contradictions, spatial belonging or exclusion, examples of violent love, and challenge ideas of progress in the context of capitalism. Insight has been provided on the rescue mission narrative nature parks portray, while removing and concealing any acts of violence or either consciously or indirectly reproducing racism and speciesism within the Park boundaries. In **part two** I focus more specifically on how animals and Indigenous people are produced relationally, while also exploring violent love through commodity representation, taxidermy and any discourses produced about them at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. A final chapter summary of both **part one** and **two** is included at the end of **part two**.

## PART TWO

### Chapter Five: The ‘Wilderness’ Experience: *Commodificaiton and Colonial Spaces*

This chapter is **part two** of my discussion of the wilderness experience. Here I focus on my second research question: how are animals and Indigenous people produced relationally to manufacture nature park fantasies?

First, I expose the commodity representation of wildlife and Indigenous people/culture in Park gift shops. Second, I analyze the Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula visitor centers, including taxidermic representations of ‘disappearing’ populations and the rescue narrative that also circulates within these colonial spaces. Importantly a major goal in this chapter is to provide a critical analysis of ‘progress’ and challenge myths of post-colonialism through my assessment of gift shops, museums and the landscape in its entirety.

#### *Park Representation and the Gift Shop Experience*

Consumption is structured to reproduce class distinctions (Baker 2002: 200).

Baker (2002) and Hermer (2002) both argue that being able to visit Algonquin or for that matter any park is a privilege associated with class distinctions. Ideas of class distinctions within ‘nature’ spaces represent fantasies of belonging in parks that according to Bryne and Wolch (2009) are a function of White nation-making or what Hage (2000) refers to as the *White nation fantasy*. Bryne and Wolch’s (2009) research finds that White individuals are most attracted to parks in order to enjoy wilderness solitude and opportunities for rigorous and challenging exercise. More specifically they report from a review of other scholars’ data that “Whites disproportionately appear to enjoy camping, hiking, hunting, boating, swimming, cycling, and dog-walking” (749). This is a significant finding since the above-mentioned activities are what

often encompass the ‘wilderness’ experience, many of them offered at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. Bryne and Wolch argue “race shapes space” and suggest ignoring racial oppression outside the park perimeter can result in “barriers to park access” (750). Bryne and Wolch’s findings are significant to my arguments since they reveal ‘wilderness’ areas are predominately White spaces. This is a result of ideas of what is enjoyable, cultural factors and accessibility barriers as a result of racism that shapes meanings and belonging in space. The point is that park spaces have been coded White. Relations within the Parks are a product of capitalism in a historical context of nation building. In addition relations within the Parks are consumptive, whereby nature, wildlife and Indigenous people are commodified for *White consumption*. When I refer to White consumption, I am suggesting that the Parks have been organized in a way that appeals to White desires and fantasies. This organization of Whiteness in parks is a result of Whites being the most common group to utilize ‘wilderness’ space, according to Byrne and Wolch (2009). While this is not to suggest only White people visit Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula, they are the most represented in these spaces.

Tourism is an activity identified as a demonstration of an individual’s privileged economic and social position (Baker 2002, Byrne and Wolch 2009, Cronin 2011, Dubinsky 1999, Francis 1992, Lemelin 2006, Thorpe 2012, Wakeham 2008). Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are spaces where individuals can travel to in order to escape the complications of modernity to enjoy the pleasures of nature, placing the traveller in a ‘contact zone’ with wild animals, Indigenous people and their land pre-European invasion (Dubinsky 2004, Pratt 1992). Dubinsky (2004) argues tourism is about difference. The animal life and Indigenous culture at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula become spectacles in which to juxtapose western imperial progress and evaluate difference in comparison to the ‘other’. Many travelers may believe that

visiting spaces, such as Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula will ‘broaden their mind’ by gaining an appreciation for nature, animal life and Indigenous culture. The Parks provide many sites of spectacles to view through ‘imperial eyes’ as this viewing of difference is the reason for visiting Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula (Dubinsky 2004, Pratt 1992). Moreover, the tourist gaze according to Dubinsky (2004) allows the traveler to construct a “relationship to its opposite non-tourist forms of social experiences and consciousness” (223). At the receiving end of spectacles, wild animals’ bodies are sites of consumption for tourists. Wildlife tourist spectacles reinforce socially constructed relations of superiority (human) and inferiority (animals), which shape our understandings of social progress. Further, Indigenous culture is entrenched within the Park. Some sites of consuming Indigenous culture include: artwork, canoeing (symbol of a primitive past and colonialism), names of campsites/lakes are Indigenous themed/named, as well as other Indigenous cultural artifacts that circulate within the landscape (Algonquin Park Website). These images formulate a journey through ‘panoptical time’ whereby “history appears as static, fixed and covered in dust” (McClintock 1995: 40).

Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula generate a high level of traffic annually, where visitors indulge their fascination for primitive ‘things’ that satisfies the quest for the wild and allows tourists to imagine a life outside of their position of privilege and power (Dubinsky 2004). Indigenous people/culture and animals become objects that can be consumed by purchasing souvenirs of wild animal figures and Indigenous cultural artifacts from the gift shop. These objects offer the traveler evidence they have made the journey to a (socially constructed) primitive space. The gift shops at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula sell commodities that reflect and help to construct the ‘wilderness’ experience in order to satisfy tourist fantasies and expectations of consuming wild ‘things’.

### *Bears are ‘Comedians’*

There are numerous reasons why I highlight bears in this research instead of many other non-human animals. Firstly, bears are among the most widely-represented animals in the gift shops and in imagery created about the Parks. Secondly, bears are important ambassadors of the Parks. Thirdly, bears are symbolic of the wilderness experience. Fourthly, there is a strange violent love relationship that we express towards bears and our attitudes shift depending on space and distance. Lastly, I focus my investigation on representation of predator species, more specifically on bears here and, in the following section, on wolves’. My justification is that predator species ignite shaper reactions on the violent love continuum. I highlight this in **Chapter Six** when I discuss the extermination of bears and wolves in urban spaces. Bears are also discussed in order to solidify important arguments that I am making about wolves, since they are also a predator species, yet are anthropomorphized in ways that wolves are not. These differences in representation reveal some important aspects of the social construction of wildlife.

To clarify when I refer to ‘bears’ I do not intend-to erase the subjectivity of each bear, or that of any non-human animals who are represented. My theoretical approach in this research prioritizes a non-speciesist analysis and I do not seek to reduce the subjectivity of individual animals to that of a single “type”, yet this language is employed since I am specifically referring to bears as a species, just as I would refer to humans as a species. This does not suggest I am insensitive to human and non-human animals’ subjectivity.

My research at both Parks reveals a similar pattern in which bears are commodified in anthropomorphic ways. Cronin (2011) finds certain non-human animals become synonymous with the Jasper National Park ‘wilderness’ experience and that this is demonstrated through Park rhetoric and tourist photography. Cronin suggests bears are commonly featured as wildlife ambassadors at Jasper and I found a similar representation at both Parks I investigated.

According to Cronin, western (and Indigenous) societies have a fascination with bears. Interest in bears is understandable, since they are powerful, human-like and dangerous. While bears are of interest to many people, the representation of bears in the west is worthy of critique.

This pattern of western fascination can be documented by analyzing how bears are often portrayed in mass media. Charmin toilet paper utilizes cartoon bears on their products and in the company's commercials, suggesting the paper is as soft as a bear. Yogi bear is a popular cartoon character in a television show and a movie. Another example of bear fascination is the ubiquitous 'teddy bear'. Bear characters have been transformed into stuffed animals for children or are a romantic gift idea for popular holidays, such as Valentine's Day and are an expression of romance in early courtship. All of these bears are represented in anthropomorphic terms and are caricatured as a species. Hermer (2002) says popular American icon 'Smokey Bear' was a real life bear mascot who symbolically became an advocate for all bears suffering from commercial exploitation. Ironically while many people claimed to admire or appreciate Smokey, he was held captive and died in captivity for the tourist gaze (Hermer 2002). Hermer argues "Smokey represents a degraded, emasculated, dancing bear of emparked nature" (95). Cronin (2011) notes that bears depicted in postcards are often juxtaposed with modern human inventions, such as railroad tracks, automobiles or golf courses. Cronin suggests that even if bears in cars appear as a clash of culture and nature "the two realms remain distinct even when appearing in the same photograph" (114). Cronin says this contradiction is rooted in the construction of bears as trivial, humorous and a species for human entertainment. This aids in the non-disruption between wilderness fantasies regardless of the obvious clash of what is constructed as nature and culture.

Representations of bears inside the Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula gift shops are strange and non-representative of real bears. Some important similarities between the two Parks confirm



Cronin and Hermer's arguments and my abovementioned examples of how bears are devalued in media. Gift shops in both Parks sell many bear-related items. A recurrent theme features cartoon black bears holding a welcome sign or waving (Figures 7, 8, 9). Both Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula shops transform cartoon bears into Christmas ornaments to purchase. These ornament bears are depicted as dancing (Figure 10) or dressed as angels (Figure 11) at Bruce Peninsula, which portrays them as humorous, goofy and cute. Bears at Bruce Peninsula gift shops are often depicted wearing human clothing (Figures 12, 13). At Algonquin I observed that the representation of bears were less devaluing and humorous (no dancing, or bears wearing human clothing). Instead I would describe them more as a souvenir memory of the 'wilderness' experience (Figure 14). This does not suggest the representation is less problematic at Algonquin, since the Algonquin ornaments depict bears as friendly and sharing a harmonious relationship with moose. Bears and other animals are depicted as participating in activities they are physically unable to do. This is exemplified in sculptures of bear characters canoeing (Figures 15, 16). Further, t-shirts and magnets depict the same themes of bears in harmony with moose, showing them canoeing together (Figures 17, 18). At both Parks teddy bears are available to purchase. Bruce Peninsula represented the teddy bear as an ambassador of Canadian national identity that is exemplified by the bear wearing a hat with "Canada" written on it, in addition to a Canadian flag stamped on the bear's foot (Figure 19). At the Algonquin gift shop one teddy bear had text written on the torso that stated "don't feed the animals, we're stuffed already, Algonquin Park" (Figure 20). Presumably this item is intended to be humorous, however it also reproduces an individualist message of self governance to refrain from feeding the animals, as mentioned in **Chapter Four**. This item serves an educational function in a comical way, instructing tourists how to behave around animals so as not to increase risks for the animals

by habituating them to human feeding that may result in discipline (extermination). However, this message individualizes a problem of coexisting with predator species and normalizes humans' practices of speciesist governance.

When bears are not represented comically as a cartoon character, sculpture, or teddy bear (which is, in fact most of the time), they are depicted as serious, bold and wild. This is a reflection of the unpredictability of bears. This theme is more visible at Algonquin gift shops than Bruce Peninsula. Algonquin has commodities that feature real photos of bears on magnets (Figure 21) and at Bruce Peninsula, postcards (Figure 22). At Bruce Peninsula one gift shop featured the skin of a bear head with a dream catcher (Figure 23). This example highlights how violent love operates across space. Both Algonquin (wilderness space) and Bruce Peninsula (nature space) are 'assumed' to protect wildlife; however, Figure 23 highlights how violence is more normalized at Bruce Peninsula. At Algonquin I did not observe any animal carcasses that were not carefully dismembered (i.e. moccasins) in order to disguise the origins of the animal. Moreover, this example demonstrates how loving and hating the same species in similar spaces can differ. This is a result of the social construction of space and perceptions of belonging. For example, Algonquin is a 'wilderness' space and skins of bear heads would not appeal to the tourists who travel there (primarily to enjoy wildlife). In contrast, at Bruce Peninsula hunting is depicted as a way of life in the region and framed as acceptable since it is assumed that the local Indigenous community participates.

Numerous t-shirt souvenirs displayed a strange theme of bears chasing and attacking humans (Figures 24, 25, 26). Presumably these t-shirts are supposed to be entertaining and humorous to nature park tourists. Dubinsky argues souvenirs provide evidence travellers have made the journey and these shirts are almost comical in the way that individuals who purchase

them could claim they ‘survived’ the ‘wilderness’ experience, specifically at Algonquin camping/portaging in an area heavily populated by bears. Figures 24 and 26 depict materials that specifically imply bears enjoy chasing and eating humans. In Figure 24 the text reads “Canadian Fast food” and in Figure 26 “bears love humans (they taste like chicken)”. These messages on the shirts suggest that animals are potential threats to humans and may eat them. In fact, this reverses the typical power relationship between humans and other animals. The most obvious example is that of “farm animals” who have been domesticated, are controlled and killed by humans in order to consume their flesh. However, other animals classified as “wildlife” are also subject to human predation in the form of recreational hunting. In comparison, the danger to humans from “wild” animals is slight. While bears rarely attack humans, there are documented cases of bears mauling humans in Algonquin and elsewhere in Canada and the United States.

One well-known case is that of Timothy Treadwell, a bear enthusiast in Alaska; he and his partner Amie Huegenard were killed and eaten by grizzly bears in 2003 and the incident became the subject for Werner Herzog’s documentary film *Grizzly Man*. These bear ‘murderers’ were actively pursued and killed. Another widely-reported case was that of Olga Moskalyova and her stepfather, Igor Tsygenikov, who were attacked and eaten by a mother bear and three cubs in Russia. This attack also resulted in the extermination of the bears. While the bears are framed in the media as having a personal vendetta against humans (Mail Online: August 17, 2011) this ignores the fact that the animals unlike some humans who hunt, do not attack for pleasure and instead for food or an act of defence. Many people respond with fear and revulsion when they hear of animals eating humans, since this is such a dramatic reversal of the usual relations of power and domination and it conflicts with the entrenched belief that humans can eat

any animal they desire. When humans are eaten by animals this threatens the human-animal divide of superiority.

According to the *Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013*, there are four different types of bears within Algonquin including: “a fleeing bear, a habituated bear, a defensive bear, and a predatory black bear” (*Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013*: 6). The most common type of bear is a fleeing bear, which causes no harm to humans. Regardless of the unpredictability of real bears, as commodities bears are trivialized for human entertainment and commodity consumption. There is nothing ‘funny’ about bears, yet humans continue to fantasize that bears are cuddly and humorous. Literature that promotes Canadian tourism utilizes images of bears as exemplified in *The Canadian Geographic* (December, 2012). Bears are important wildlife ambassadors of Canada (i.e. polar bear on Canadian currency), whereby they are portrayed as majestic creatures of the ‘great Canadian north’. Further, Canada is well-known internationally for having the highest polar bear populations where tourists are able to view them (Lemelin 2006).

Coleman (2004) provides a historical context exploring what has led to the social construction of bears and wolves. He argues that in folklore and oral narratives, bears were constructed as ‘funnier’ than wolves. Coleman (2004) argues this could be a result of the increased likelihood that bears will attack humans under the right circumstances and there is a level of competition for survival. According to Coleman, “animal comedy masks human pain” that specifically pertains to bears, since they are much more unpredictable than wolves regardless of the fact that wolves were the target of persecution (117). Turning bears into jokes masks the real fears that bears ignite. On the sociozoologic scale, bears are constructed as demons, since they challenge the social order of power as exemplified by the case of bears eating humans (for

example: Timothy Treadwell). This concept that Coleman describes is important to consider in this research, since this is a repetitive theme found in the gift shops. As mentioned above, many animals (including bears) are anthropomorphized. A continual theme I observed through the deconstruction and critique of gift shop commodities at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula is that humans disguise their fear of bears with humour for supremacist reasons (we fear ‘others’ that threaten our superiority). This finding is interesting since other feared populations (Indigenous people) are also ridiculed and infantilized in order to deflect any anxieties.

My analysis on bear commodification has exposed contradictions in representation of bears in the space of Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. These contradictions are multi-layered, including bears being depicted as serious and comical within the same space and in the case of Bruce Peninsula the skin of a bear head is an explicit example of violent love.

### *Wolves as ‘Wilderness’*

The truth is we know little about the wolf. What we know a good deal more about is what we imagine the wolf to be (Lopez 1978: 3).

Wolves are one of the most misrepresented species on earth (Lopez 1978). The historical construction of wolves is a narrative of vilification that resulted in widespread extermination (Coleman 2004, Lopez 1978). According to Jones (2003), media and nature writing have contributed to shaping attitudes towards wolves. She argues children’s stories such as *The Boy Who Cried Wolf*, *Little Red Riding Hood* and, I would add, *The Three Little Pigs*, along with many other stories, perpetuates the “assumption of canine malevolence, the cunning lupine villain pitted against an embattled human community” (Jones 2003:1). Coleman (2004) also echoes this narrative that he links to folklore, whereby he reports there is a common theme of the stalking wolf in the forest who threatens the vulnerable victimized lost traveler. Negative portrayals of wolves are not only a historical narrative. This theme continues in recent popular

films, such as *The Grey*. The film depicts wolves as warriors of the wilderness and perpetuates stereotypes of wolves as bloodthirsty predators waiting to hunt down humans. Many scholars have reported the ambivalent relationship humans have towards wolves (Coleman 2004, Lopez 1978, Jones 2002).

Firstly, to clarify the wolves that reside in Algonquin are accurately identified as the coywolf. The coywolf is a new species that originated from Algonquin. A result of the decimation of grey wolves, the original inhabitants were forced to mate with coyotes in order to survive (*Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park* 2002). While wolves, coywolves and coyotes are three distinct species I will refer to them interchangeably within Park spaces, since determining which breed they are is difficult (officially within Algonquin wolves are referred to as the eastern wolf). My investigation at the gift shops at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula revealed evidence of a continued ambivalent and contradictory relationship humans have with wolves and coyotes. First, I unpack commodity representations of wolves as souvenirs that can be purchased by tourists. Unlike bears who are anthropomorphized repeatedly and often ridiculed as a species, wolves are commodified as serious and always represented as wild. At Algonquin wolves are represented as synonymous with the wilderness that is demonstrated on coffee mugs (Figures 27, 28, 29), t-shirts (Figures 30, 31, 32), key chains (Figure 33) and a picture painting that featured a solo wolf lurking between the trees in the woods (Figure 34).

In each of the identified examples above, wolves are represented as serious, solo and in a wilderness setting. This is an interesting finding since wolves are almost never solo. Bekoff (2007) argues wolves are pack animals that are highly social that depend on group cooperation in order for survival. Commodity representations of wolves as solo could be a larger fantasy that rejects the sociability of animals that have been heavily policed and persecuted. This may be

linked to guilt that we violently executed a social species. Further, this fantasy allows humans to ease fears of wolf pack predation. The fantasy of a solo wolf is less threatening than a wolf pack family that stems from colonial ideas of domination, since the presence of a wolf pack challenges human superiority.

Another finding is that, unlike bears whose animal identity appears to have been transformed in many commodities, wolves on the other hand appear static and frozen in a state of nature through their constant representation in a wilderness setting. A popular image of wolves on souvenirs sold throughout the Park is the iconic symbol of the wolf howling; an act that is celebrated as a monumental experience. Jones (2002) argues wolves have become a potent symbol of the wilderness that is a result of human constructions of them as wild, untamed and free, associations that are central to the wilderness experience. This is significant since bears are also predator animals who are often only found in a 'wilderness', yet they are constructed in radically different ways than wolves. Also, wolves are never transformed into a cartoon character as bears, moose, and beavers routinely are. This may be linked to what Lopez (1978) refers to as *theriophobia*, which he explains is fear of the 'beast'. Lopez (1978) explores this phenomenon in order to explain the hatred and excess killing of wolves in a historical context. He suggests human fears are a scapegoat for our own "fear of the projected beast in oneself" (Lopez 1978:140). Wolves are also vilified for the economic damages they cause, for example killing farm animals who are viewed as property (Emel 1998, Kellert 1985). Another explanation for wolf condemnation is that wolves consume 'sport' animals that hunters also desire to kill (Wolch and Emel 1998). This may explain that while both wolves and bears are feared, only one (the wolf) is vilified. Further, attitudes towards wolves are also linked to our relationship with the 'wilderness' (Lopez 1978). We have a contradictory relationship with the 'wilderness', since on

the one hand the wilderness is a feared space, yet many Canadians simultaneously desire to travel to these spaces (Francis 1997). Additionally, we have built our Canadian national identity around the belief that we enjoy the 'wilderness'. I find this interesting since much of Canada's historical hardships are involved with overcoming the untamed wild forests. Wolves are represented in the gift shops as wild and serious as a reminder to Canadians of our ability to control and overcome nature. While wolves are 'wild' they can still be conquered. Wolves may be viewed as more challenging to control, since they are social pack animals in comparison to bears. Therefore, the conquering of wolves is viewed as a population management celebration of colonized others. This contributes to building identities of superiority and human progress over nature in a colonized space. To be clear I am not suggesting that all tourists view wolves through this lens, since many park visitors respect and admire wolves (violent love). I am instead attempting to understand an important representational difference in gift shops between different animal species that is a result of deeply ingrained beliefs, conscious or unconscious.

Bruce Peninsula shops contained far fewer items celebrating wolves' existence within the Park; I found them depicted only on postcards (Figures 35, 36) a t-shirt (Figure 37) and sweater (Figure 38). In an Indigenous owned and operated gift shop, wolves are represented as respected animals (Figure 39). This representation is also noted by Figari and Skogen (2011) who conducted focus groups that revealed that many participants express nostalgia for wolves and referred to wolves as a noble and intelligent species. Also, in the *Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park* (2002), Park literature producers identify wolves as significant animals who play an important role in the balance of ecosystems and warrant protection and respect. While wolves in Bruce Peninsula are not often represented as souvenirs, when they were, representations confirmed the themes of admiration and wilderness that I found within



Algonquin. Coyotes, on the other hand, within Bruce Peninsula seemed to be constructed as pest animals and less noble than the wolf. These differences in representation of closely-related species may be influenced by the perceived abundant population of coyotes in comparison to grey wolves. At the Indigenous gift shop and another shop located in the Tobermory hub, entire coyote pelts were being sold to tourists (Figures 40, 41). Evidence of hunting culture is a direct contradiction of the wilderness fantasy.

Seeing wildlife, especially predator species that are perceived as synonymous with wilderness, such as wolves, is a general expectation of visiting nature parks (Jones 2002). Given the fact that observation of wildlife is such a key aspect of the wilderness experience, it is striking that the Park gift shops would sell the body parts of animals who had been killed. The motivation for purchasing such items represents an interesting question. If people visit nature parks as an extension of their appreciation for wildlife and nature, then why would some of these individuals choose to purchase an animal pelt as a souvenir? As with sport hunters, these animal skins serve as trophies and as evidence of visiting a wilderness area, providing an exotic tale to retell family and friends back home. The differences in wolf representation in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula may be a result of the social constructions of the Parks' experiences. In tourist literature, Algonquin is promoted to offer a wilderness experience, whereas Bruce Peninsula is described as a semi-wilderness space. While in both Parks tourists may expect to see wildlife, the species they anticipate viewing shifts across space. Wilderness spaces, such as Algonquin generate higher expectations of seeing more exotic wildlife, such as top predators, including wolves and bears. Therefore, in order to fulfill tourist fantasies of wildlife protection in the Algonquin 'wilderness', any signs of hunting must be concealed (selling entire animal pelts),

whereas at Bruce Peninsula, hunting is more accepted since it is promoted as supporting Indigenous culture.

My investigation of Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula gift shops demonstrates that the dominant depiction in commodity representations of wolves is that they are serious, wild, and threatening, and that they embody what is constructed as wilderness. The coyote, a relative of the wolf, is often represented as a pelt at Bruce Peninsula. This finding is significant and raises further questions as to how deep contradictions are across related species, especially when we recall that wolves, coyotes and dogs are all closely related. Many people who visit nature parks bring their companion animals (dogs) and view these animals as part of the nuclear family. Are some of the same people who purchase coyote pelt souvenirs also owners of beloved dogs? While this question cannot be answered in this research, it does challenge the logic of our attitudes towards similar species and expose some striking contradictions: an individual who advocates for wolves may despise coyotes and another who dislikes both wolves and coyotes may identify as a dog lover.

Wolf representation is important to study in order to make connections between racism and speciesism. Also, wolves are often conflated with Indigenous people, who share similar histories of colonization and are both viewed as not belonging in urban spaces.

### *The Moose and Canadianness is Wilderness*

The most famous animals after the wolf and bear within Algonquin are the moose, chipmunk and loon. Animals at Algonquin are commonly transformed into emblems on modern day conveniences, such as wine stoppers (Figure 42), coffee mugs (Figure 43), bottle openers (Figure 44), nightlights (Figure 45), music of wildlife (Figure 46), and travel mugs (Figure 47). These commodity items demonstrate a merging of the 'wilderness' with items only suitable for

urban and suburban living. Such transformations of wildlife into modern conveniences as souvenirs are represented unproblematically but this transformation is a complex and crucial aspect that reinforces fantasies of bringing some of the 'wild' home. These types of items reinforce unequal power relations between animals and humans. Transforming animals into commodities for human conveniences often serves to ridicule animals and ignore their individual agency. The fact that humans find these types of souvenirs entertaining or funny is a vital contribution to identity-making as humans project their gaze at animal spectacles and reproduce relations of superiority and inferiority. Although it can be suggested that wildlife souvenirs serve an educational or compassionate function and promote appreciation for wildlife, the fact that White humans are not transformed into souvenirs suggests that these images are actually a reinforcement of power relations, since it is humans who can continually consume exoticism or what they determine to be- primitive or 'other'. Moreover, to be in a privileged position to project our tourist gazes at 'others' demonstrates the colonial logic that continues to operate. Animals are always spectacles, while humans profit from depicting animals as commodities doing human activities for our entertainment and pleasure. This reduces animal lives to the needs and benefits of humans, whereby an animal's worth is measured by what they can offer us.

Moose are another animal within Algonquin that generate tourist enthusiasm. The limited opportunities of seeing a moose outside a heavily forested area contributes to the popularity of these animals. The increased viewing possibilities in Algonquin can contribute to an individual's wilderness experience and indeed seeing these animals may be counted as a key component of that experience. Moose are often anthropomorphized in gift shops similarly to bears, and also like bears, are often depicted as a majestic wild animal. Another important aspect is the fact that the moose is often associated with Canadian identity. Links to Canadian identity with the moose

are exemplified in the following examples: Figure 48 depicts an item for sale entitled “chocolate moose droppings” with a Canadian flag in the center; in Figure 49 there is a (fake) stuffed moose wearing a vest with “Canada” written on it; and, Figure 50 shows a moose coaster next to a Canadian maple leaf kitchen glove. Figure 51 shows a t-shirt printed with the words: “Canada’s moose wanted...warning extremely horny and very mooschievous”. In another t-shirt moose are transformed into cartoon characters that are all drinking alcohol at a bar, the shirt text reads: Algonquin Park, beware: moose dropping (Figure 52). These souvenir items represent the moose as deviant, humorous and mischievous. While moose are represented in commodities as humorous, it is important to report the strength of this species.

Moose are the most powerful herbivore animal within Algonquin, and out of all the mammals they are the largest (*Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park 2002*). Regardless of predator species that reside in Algonquin, specifically wolves (carnivores) or bears (omnivores) moose are not often targeted, and when they are pursued it is usually the moose calves. According to the *Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park (2002)* pamphlet, the biggest threats to moose are death by motor vehicle, ticks that attack their brain, or in the winter some moose may fall through weak ice over water as a result of their large structure. Moreover, the overall strength and power of moose and other animals, such as bears is glossed over in commodity representation through anthropomorphism and turning animals into jokes. My reading of this theme demonstrates that humans’ constructions of animals’ is a product of fantasy-making and is a form of mastery and control over non-human animals. At a broader level this theme of anthropomorphism at the gift shops cumulatively contributes to shaping attitudes of naturalized human domination and control over the natural world that is a construction of colonial

mentalities, whereby humans (Whites) are the governors of the land, while animals (and primitive people) are to be governed.

As reported above, bears and moose are often transformed into cartoon characters and this is often the case for beavers at Bruce Peninsula. Figure 53 shows: cartoon characters including; moose, bears and beavers, presented in harmony holding a Canadian flag as an expression of Canadian national identity. The theme of Canadian identity is emphasized within the two nature Park gift shops, typically expressed through symbolism of the maple leaf. This is evident at Algonquin in Figure 54 and Figure 55 through merchandising of Canadian maple syrup, the preservation and commodification of real maple (Figure 56), and maple leaf kitchen supplies (Figure 49). At Bruce Peninsula, Canadian identity is represented on postcards of wildlife (Figures 35, 36, 57), in Figure 58 on a water bottle and Figure 59 shows key chains bearing imagery of symbolism that many Canadians identify with nationalism; including wildlife, Indigenous cultural iconology and the maple leaf.

I observed differences in how Canadian identity is represented in commodities at different Parks. Algonquin seemed to represent the Park itself as an experience of Canadianness and presented the space as a journey of Canadian identity. Canadian identity is more actively presented within Algonquin in comparison to Bruce Peninsula. When I refer to active presence, I am suggesting the Park embodies aspects of the Canadian wilderness experience. Bruce Peninsula represents Canadian identity more passively, exemplified through postcard representation. At Bruce Peninsula, postcards with wildlife had “Canada” written on them, while at Algonquin the postcards had “Algonquin Park” on them. This was evident sometimes for the exact same postcard; presumably the photos were taken at Algonquin, yet both represent the Canadian wilderness. My reading of this is that Algonquin is commodified as the Canadian

experience, while Bruce Peninsula represents the experience. To clarify, I am suggesting that Algonquin is constructed as a piece of land that is preserved as a primitive place that is the ‘traditional’ Canadian wilderness experience, whereas at Bruce Peninsula there is more of an extinction narrative that suggests the Park is only a representation of what the landscape once was and is framed as more of a tourist landmark than an active experience of the wilderness. Lastly, the postcards of the grey wolf at Bruce Peninsula are a fantasy, since grey wolves are presumed to have been removed from this space and there is almost no discussion of them at this Park. On the other hand at Algonquin, wolf populations thrive; this is one of the most significant points that distinguishes Algonquin from most other national and provincial parks. The possibility of viewing a wolf at Algonquin is a demonstration of the active wilderness experience, in comparison to Bruce Peninsula, where wildlife is present mainly in postcards, which is a more passive experience of Canadian identity.

Another popular sign of Canadian national identity within both Parks is the canoe. Francis (1997) argues icons of the canoe is essential to Canadians nationality and is as important to our identity as “the beaver or the Canada goose or the maple leaf, the canoe is presented as our link to the land, to the past, to our Indigenous forebears, and to our spiritual roots” (129). The canoe reflects Canadian character according to Francis (1997). He argues the canoe has become synonymous with the “wilderness experience it implies” that he suggests is a result of the Group of Seven’s nationalist agenda to paint the nation that contributed to the ideology of Canada as a wilderness (Francis 1997:134). The Group of Seven has been scrutinized by many scholars for dehistoricizing ‘wilderness’ and perpetuating empty-land myths linked to White national fantasies to erase Indigenous people from the land and nation.

‘The canoe’ is a perpetual icon throughout Algonquin in paintings and is featured on souvenir items for sale in the gift shop. Canoes become dip pots (Figure 60), t-shirts (Figures 61, 62) and mugs, glasses and shooter cups (Figure 4). Also, canoeing is a popular recreational activity at Algonquin. As mentioned above, bears and moose are often anthropomorphized and commodified as canoe paddlers. In Figure 4 the symbol of a canoe over the head of a man reconfirms earlier arguments of Algonquin being constructed as a male space. Overall, the canoe is a powerful and loaded symbol that is rooted in our construction of Canada as a wilderness. White individuals’ perception of wilderness is often a fantasy that is uncritical of who is absent and who was displaced in order for a White wilderness space to exist

### *Indigeneity: A Spectacle of Consumption and Commodification*

According to Dubinsky (2004), Indigenous people signify the wilderness that is a direct opposite to constructions of civilization patrolled carefully by White Europeans. It appears that as a result of boundary-making of categories of belonging, Indigenous culture can be celebrated within ‘wilderness’ spaces, since the wilderness has been constructed to include Indigenous people and culture. Further, the inclusion of Indigenous culture at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula enhances the wilderness experience for non-Indigenous people, since Indigenous culture/people are viewed commodities for non-Indigenous consumption. Indigenous culture is synonymous with the ‘wilderness,’ since Indigenous populations have been constructed as primitive and closer to nature. An important finding is that Indigenous culture is more commonly commodified within the Parks than as people. When they are transformed into people as souvenirs, they are constructed artificially and derogatively. Francis (1992) argues Indigenous culture is often commodified since there is a widely held fantasy that most Indigenous people

have disappeared. The desire to restore Indigenous culture in specific spaces is linked to larger colonial agendas.

Dubinsky (2004) argues there is a well-documented history of individuals “collecting Indian curiosities” that she links to the reinforcement of hierarchical relations (228). My investigation of gift shops confirms this. Firstly, the Inukshuk is a popular souvenir available for purchase at both Parks. The Inukshuk, a representation of a standing man created with piled stones, is associated with Inuit populations of “Canada’s far northern regions” (Figure 63). This Indigenous cultural iconic symbol is linked to notions of Canadianness in general and to the Canada wilderness in particular. For example, the 2012 Vancouver Olympic Games adopted the Inukshuk symbol and engraved it on the medals awarded to athletes. At the art museum gift shop in Algonquin there are many Inukshuks available to purchase (Figures 64, 65). Bruce Peninsula also sells Inukshuk sculptures at gift shops (Figures 66, 67, 68) and is also featured in postcards (Figure 69). The significance of this commodity is the association this item has to Indigenous culture and to the wilderness that reinforces ideas of belonging in different spaces. Further, Inuit populations did not historically live at either Park, yet the Inukshuk symbol is heavily commodified within the Parks. Moreover, this commodity representation demonstrates how images are taken from various Indigenous cultures that are dehistoricized and detached from the actual spaces these societies inhabited. Indigenous people are just linked with nature indiscriminantly.

Another dominant commodity representation of Indigenous culture is the emphasis on spirituality. Francis (1992) argues that “non-Natives still seem to be most comfortable when they can infantilize and spiritualize Indigenous people” (240). I found a number of tourist items for sale at both Parks that confirm Francis’s observation. At Algonquin, individuals can purchase



healing stone necklaces (Figure 70), tribal bracelets (Figures 71; 72), spirit bracelets (Figure 73), medicine stones (Figure 74), and totem stones (Figure 75). Bruce Peninsula sells miniature ceremonial Indigenous drums (Figure 76), totem zipper pulls (Figure 77), and dream catchers (Figure 78). Ceremonial mask commodities at Algonquin (Figure 79) and Bruce Peninsula (Figures 80, 81) are highly problematic. Like the abovementioned commodities, these are marketed as spiritual items that have been genuinely handcrafted by Indigenous people. While these masks may appear as unproblematic to many uncritical tourists, my deconstruction of the masks reveal that they reinforce constructions of Indigenous people as ‘savages’, primitive and ‘other’ (Figures 80, 81) that are an example of what Dubinsky refers to as “the reinscription of racism” (228). These masks reproduce myths of difference of the savage ‘other’ that may contribute to formulating or reinforcing White supremacist attitudes and practices.

Indigenous culture is perpetually celebrated in Park gift shops as trendy through the selling of feather earrings (Figure 82), feather hair extensions (Figure 83), and fashionable bracelets (Figure 84) at Algonquin. While some individuals may argue these souvenirs may be an expression of appreciation for other cultures I suggest that the ability to play ‘Indian’ and what Francis (1992) refers to as the desire for “Whites to go Native” is a fantasy that supports White privilege (171). A White individual can dress “Indian” but has the privilege to remove the items and maintain White privilege, while remaining ambivalent about white settler genocide. Francis (1992) argues that fascinations with Indigenous people begin in early childhood and do not necessarily dissolve as Francis suggests “many of us have not got over a keen interest in Indians and in wildlife” (171). While some people argue this fascination with Indigenous people is positive, our level of interest and appreciation with Indigenous people is space specific. This

spatial dimension is central to colonial logic. Here I am highlighting the contradictory attitudes that are expressed towards colonized groups within park spaces in comparison to urban areas.

At Bruce Peninsula there is less association with fashion items of Indigeness and more a representation of Indigenous people as mannequins or statues as exemplified in Figures, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90. The representation of Indigenous people at Bruce Peninsula is equally or more problematic than Algonquin. Many of the commodity representations reinforce stereotypes of what Francis refers to as the 'Imaginary Indian' that he defines as a White man's fantasy and a manufactured creation. Many of the representations of female Indigenous people are princesses, while many others are infantilized. Bird (2001) confirms the perpetual representation of Indigenous women as the 'Indian Princess.' This is an important myth that is reproduced within Bruce Peninsula because it retells the fantasy to tourists that Canadians (White settler society) 'peacefully' took over the land. This myth is disguised in rescue rhetoric of civilizing Indigenous populations. Importantly, this fantasy erases Indigenous resistance and the forceful removal of Indigenous people from the land (including the making of the 'wilderness'). Further, Bird (2001) suggests the transformation of Indigenous women as princesses is a symbol of the virgin land that is possessed and consumed by White men. According to Bird (2001), the construction of the 'Indian Princess' is also linked to nation building agendas, whereby the Princess represents a "non-threatening symbol of White American's right to be here" (79). This commodity representation is a dominant theme in spaces such as Bruce Peninsula, since nature parks include Indigenous culture as an integral part of the landscape. These types of objectifying representations aid in creating a sense of place in a colonized space and country, as well as contribute to White fantasies that Indigenous people have disappeared and when they are visible they are depicted as non-threatening through representation as the 'Imaginary Indian'.

Indigenous men are often represented at Bruce Peninsula as what Francis calls the ‘noble savage’. According to Bird (2001), Indigenous males in mainstream White society are primarily noble, emotionless warriors or primitive ‘savage others.’ The representation of Indigenous men as commodities reproduces fantasies of Indigenous defeat (Figure 91). Here the tourist can project their gaze at a once feared Indigenous warrior that has been transformed into a commodity that symbolizes their ‘death’ (a fantasy). This is a celebration of White control to secure White investment by dominating a group deemed threatening. These commodity items allow Whites to judge their ‘progress’ in comparison to what they have constructed as inferior. These commodities are heavily racialized, gendered, and nationalist that reinforces stereotypes that are perpetually circulated by Whites, which are aligned with fantasies rather than reflecting the subjective lives of Indigenous people in Canada.

The disruption of the fantasy often occurs when non-Indigenous people come into contact with an Indigenous individual. Francis (1992) argues that many Euro-Canadians may be shocked that Indigenous people do not dress according to stereotypical representations. At Bruce Peninsula there is a gift shop separated from the main tourist area that is operated by an Indigenous man. At this shop, items for sale include commodities of Indigenous culture, as well as animal pelts. Some people may claim this is supporting Indigenous people. However, the reality of Indigenous people having to sell souvenirs of themselves and culture to predominately White tourists who symbolize the conquest is an example of revictimization.

Dubinsky (2004) argues Indigenous peoples’ participation in the tourist industry is most likely an attempt to “make the best of a bad situation” (228). The Indigenous operated tourist shop at Bruce Peninsula was itself very different than all other gift shops. This shop was nothing more than a large wooden shed with gravel floors and no windows (Figure 92). I highlight this

sharp difference since this example demonstrates the impoverished conditions and constrained choices of Indigenous people. The Indigenous gift shop was not a typical souvenir shopping experience and demonstrates the marginalization Indigenous people encounter that may lead them to participate in their own cultural appropriation in order to survive. Further, the Indigenous gift shop and the Indigenous man selling the items in the shop are both tourist spectacles for the ‘imperial eyes’ of Whites seeking a quest for difference. The Indigenous man is what Dubinsky refers to as a “walking tourist attraction” to travelers seeking the wilderness experience (223). This gift shop is an example of a ‘contact zone,’ whereby according to Pratt (1992) this is a space where two people who are “geographically and historically segregated come into contact with each other... usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality and intractable conflict” (8). While the Indigenous gift shop may not be an example of physical conflict, the conditions that push Indigenous people into tourist industries and jobs is grounded in radical inequality, as a result of the realities of colonization. Consumption of Indigenous souvenirs and people should never be viewed as a harmless or innocent tourist activity.

Another dominant narrative within both Parks is the emphasis on commodities being authentically Canadian and or Indigenous (Figure 93). Firstly, this discourse reinforces ideas of ‘Whites’ (non-Indigenous populations) rescuing Indigenous people through purchasing their handmade crafts and souvenirs. When I refer to rescue here I am suggesting Whites can distance themselves and remove responsibility from a legacy of colonialism and assimilative policies through supporting Indigenous people by purchasing souvenirs supposedly made by Indigenous people. Further, the dominant theme of Canadian and or Indigenous authenticity is connected to the era of globalization.

Many consumer goods in affluent westernized countries, such as Canada have shifted to outsourcing and manufacturing products in countries that have inadequate environmental standards and minimal labour protections in order to produce the product for the cheapest price to remain competitive in a capitalist global economy. As a result, people are often alienated and disconnected from the products we consume and produce. There seems to be a level of nationalist pride in that Canadians desire to buy Canadian products. For example, as a White Canadian myself I have witnessed the growing movement of resistance specifically against purchasing products from China that could be linked to the rising fears of the threat of China as the next global empire. Hage (2000) argues Asian populations have historically and continue to be portrayed as high performers that ignite White fears over loss of control. Therefore, this explanation may provide some insight into this growing trend of people purchasing items they define as reconnecting with their heritage (Indigenous) or supporting the Canadian economy that may explain the appeal of items, such as moccasins.

This is especially important in spaces constructed as wilderness, such as Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula since they emphasize both Indigenous culture and are national spaces that embody the Canadian national identity. While there are numerous reasons for resistance to consumption of products from China, (e.g. human rights violations) there seems to be a myth that purchasing 'Canadian' products is not exploitative, however, there is widespread exploitation within Canada (not to the same degree as China as there are different laws and regulations). Moreover, when individuals purchase moccasins or other Indigenous items there is a fantasy they are supporting Indigenous producers, yet in reality the proceeds are likely not significant if they are sold by corporations or other businesses. Additionally, this non-exploitative myth of

Canadian products ignores how items such as moccasins involve the killing of animals and tanning of animal hides and furs that poses health concerns.

Cronin (2011) reports a similar theme of Indigenous cultural items being sold in tourist shops at Jasper National Park. She suggests First Nations people in the Rocky Mountain region “did not carve totem poles” and any reference to Indigenous people within the Park space are manufactured in order to appeal to the “imagination and fantasies of tourists” (41). Dubinsky analyzes and evaluates tourist reactions in Niagara Falls, Ontario to Indigenous handicrafts. She reports that many tourists suggested the souvenirs were “grotesque and gaudy” yet purchased these same items (Dubinsky 2004:228). Dubinsky (2004) argues consumption of souvenirs is a demonstration tourists have made the journey to a ‘wild’ space and “attained a certain level of Indianness” (228). This is even more prevalent within ‘wilderness’ spaces that stress survival, as well as, physical and mental strength. Therefore bringing home souvenirs are evidence of a return to civilization ‘unscratched’ from the forces of the wild.

Dubinsky (2004) and Francis (1992) both argue there is a love/hate relationship with Indigenous people. Dubinsky argues many individuals are ambivalent about the same people who make their homemade Indigenous cultural artifacts. Francis (1992) similarly argues there are “almost schizophrenic attitudes” (I refer to this as “inconsistent” in order to avoid oppressive rhetoric) that Canadians have demonstrated towards Indigenous people (171). This research confronts the complexities of this phenomenon across space and provides a counterpoint to my work in **Chapter Six** that juxtaposes representations of Indigenous people outside the park perimeter in comparison to representation in ‘wilderness’ spaces.

*Relational Theme of Manufacturing Wilderness Fantasies and Violent Love of Moccasins*

At Bruce Peninsula there was strong evidence of the overlapping of Indigenous culture with fur wearing. Bruce Peninsula sells many different types of animal pelts (wolves, coyotes, racoons, and foxes) in the gift shops as souvenirs, in addition to hats or key chains made from skunks or racoons (Figures 94, 95, 96). Bird feathers are frequently featured with Indigenous cultural artifacts exemplified by dream catchers (Figure 78). Here is the theme of Indigenous spirituality and feathers from an animal (bird) sold to curious and fascinated tourists. Many of the commodity Indigenous people (not real people: dolls, sculptures, etc. for sale) are wearing animal skins (leather/suede) or fur (Figures 85, 86, 87). In Figure 97 a moose is positioned in a display with a teepee and a fur carpet suggesting these items all embody the wilderness. Again the representation of fur with Indigenous people and a suede teepee is exhibited in Figure 98. In Figure 99 the plastic Indigenous female is holding a bow and arrow covered in fur that reproduces stereotypes that many Indigenous communities are still predominately hunters. While some Indigenous groups and individuals may engage in subsistence hunting, this generalization is applied to all Indigenous people that perpetuates myths of Indigenous people as primitive and degenerate on the scale of 'progress'. This myth of Indigenous populations operating a key role in hunting and fur trading is linked to the Canadian fur industries big marketing campaign in recent years that emphasized how much they are helping Indigenous people, who are all identified as fur trappers (Global Action Network, Sorenson 2010). Global Action Network and Sorenson 2010 dispute these myths and below I demystify claims that the fur industry is helping Indigenous people in Canada. These stereotypical representations of Indigenous people in Figure 99 ignore the large number of White men and in some cases women, who hunt wild animals for trophies.

Another dominant theme is the representation of Indigenous people/culture with wolves. In Figure 39, there is a connection made between Indigenous spirituality and the noble wolf. Further, in Figure 100 a young Indigenous female is featured with three wolf pups. They are all infantilized and represented as non-threatening that appear in harmony with one another. All of these commodity representations reproduce many of Francis's descriptions of the 'Imaginary Indian' that depict Indigenous people as closer to nature and synonymous with the wilderness experience. Further, according to Wakeham (2008) there is an important significance of taxidermic wolves and mannequin Indigenous people appearing together at museums, since they both represent the wild, free, and undomesticated members of a primitive past that are viewed as disappearing.

I directly observed at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula that moccasins are one of the most popular souvenirs to purchase. Deconstructing moccasins provides insight into many of the arguments this research has highlighted thus far. They are reported to be authentically Canadian and designed/made by Indigenous people. Moccasins commodify an entire culture that is consumed by individuals who signify the conquest. Also, moccasins are made of animal skins and furs, which is a strong example of violent love that exists within nature parks.

To begin, moccasins are an example of commodity racism. McClintock (1995) defines commodity racism as "a form of advertising and photography, the imperial expositions and the museum movement-converted the narrative of imperial progress into mass-produced consumer spectacles" (33). This shift in racism is significant as this suggests there has been a transfer from traditional and scientific racism to more symbolic types of racism (McClintock 1995). Stoler (2002) argues racism has become more complex and "the new racism is marked as more insidious, silently sophisticated, subtle and therefore novel phenomenon" (371). Moreover, I



apply McClintock's idea of commodity racism to speciesism, which is a prejudice and type of discrimination based on an individuals' species membership (Dunayer 2004). I call this commodity speciesism and suggest that this parallels the definition of commodity racism, whereby animals are transformed into mass-produced spectacles for White people to juxtapose their progress. The fur industry is an example of commodity racism and commodity speciesism that obscures the colonial relationships that exist amongst the consumer and the spectacle of the commodity. Paradoxically, the capitalist forces from White people drove the genocide against Indigenous people and non-human animals. Both of these marginalized groups are re-victimized through their transformation into spectacles and commodities of fashion fur. Moreover, there is a dialectical relationship between fur as an assault against the Indigenous and an act of killing wild animals that symbolically represents the continued goal of 'White national governors' to dominate nature (Emel 1998, Hage 2000).

While moccasins are presented as having been made by Indigenous people within Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula I am skeptical about these claims, since one worker at a gift shop informed me that one moccasin brand was made at a factory in Cambridge, Ontario. Regardless if Indigenous people did authentically create the moccasins sold at the two Parks under investigation this information ignores the structural barriers that push Indigenous populations into the tourist trade. Further, the idea that moccasins are an Indigenous cultural celebration for Whites ignores that animals who are killed and skinned for the furs for moccasins also have culture. This trump of human culture over animals is rooted in speciesist understandings.

Moccasins are also an example of symbolic time travel, what McClintock's refers to as panoptical time that is exemplified on a poster near the moccasin stand at Algonquin:

Our story begins in Canada thousands of years ago, when our ancestors created the mukluks and moccasins you see in these pages. Throughout history, Indigenous nations used distinctive leather, furs and beadwork to reflect their individual customs and culture. Today, as Métis, we continue this tradition by creating authentic, functional footwear that connects our past with new materials and production techniques. Stitch by Stitch, bead by bead, we tell the story of our people (Figure 101).

Panoptical time is described by McClintock (1995) as an “image of global history consumed at a glance in a single spectacle from a point of privileged invisibility” (37). The narrative presented in the poster simplifies the history of Indigenous people to a consumer product that is illustrated in this specific statement: “we tell the story of our people”. Yet, the violence and colonial practices of Indigenous history are carefully concealed in the sanitized space of a wilderness park since this would interrupt fantasies we have of them and with the wilderness. Consumption of this knowledge would disrupt ideas of Whites belonging in a country they perceive as White space.

The information in Figure 101 is interesting to highlight since it reproduces ideas of the Imaginary Indian: that is an Indigenous person covered in fur and animal skins that characterizes them as primitive and less evolved in comparison to Euro-Canadians. Further, the written description continues to link Indigenous people with the fur trade and ignores the abuses of the fur industry historically and contemporarily. Images of fur in advertisements and fur wearing are a journey of panoptical time for the White capitalist consumer who can participate and understand their own ‘progress’ by direct consumption and domination of nature, which has been constructed as inferior to civilization from early colonial western dualisms (Emel 1998). Indigenous people and many wild non-human animals have been exterminated to the near point of extinction (Emel 1998, Wakeham 2008). The White nation’s goal for these groups is to disappear (Emel 1998, Francis 1992, Kellert 1985, Wakeham 2008). Fur is a continued reminder that threats to modernity and Whiteness must be controlled. To clarify, I am suggesting that fur represents human domination over nature that keeps the human-animal divide in check.

Furthermore, it is imperative I highlight that in the same advertisement of written text about the ‘authentic’ moccasins is presumably an Indigenous woman who is wearing a Canada Goose Jacket (Figure 102). This is an example of commodity speciesism, commodity racism, and violent love, in addition to this company profiting from exploiting the Canadian national identity of the wilderness.

The Canada Goose Company designs winter jackets that use coyote fur trim. Their fur policy information on the website and video narrated by the CEO of Canada Goose is highly problematic. Firstly, the discourse of coyote population, threat and construction of pest is a narrative that justifies the death of thousands of coyotes. On their website Canada Goose claims “in many regions of Canada coyotes are considered a pest as they attack livestock, endangered prey species, pets and sometimes even people”. These claims support Emel’s (1998) arguments that wolves, who share similar ancestry with coyotes are constructed as a feared ‘other’ that jeopardizes White property (livestock), in addition to their predatory status as a threat to humans, which aids in building public support for their eradication. Loo (2006) also suggests coyotes are constituted as a trespassing threat and their ‘overpopulation’ warrants control. This narrative of overpopulation is interesting as this is a prominent theme of racist discourse as well. Hage (2000) argues overpopulation or ‘too many Asians’ requires control and management through discriminatory anti-immigration policies. Further, Canada Goose’s company name is interesting as the company exploits ducks and geese for their feathers to fill the jackets, while using non-human animals as a mascot for their product. This is evidence of the violent love relationship people, especially Canadians have with animals (Emel 1998, Littlefield 2010, Luke 1998, Sorenson 2010). A CDA reveals parallels to symbolism of the beaver on the nickel (Sorenson

2010). The more hidden message articulates narratives of White nationalism, colonialism and genocide of Indigenous people and non-human animals alike.

Canada Goose Company also claims they have “learned from the Indigenous people of Canada’s North” about the utility and warmth coyote fur provides, assertions that again justify the use of coyote fur, as a useful commodity by marketing Indigenous knowledge as truth when this is convenient for White capitalists to profit. The Canada Goose Company also claims under their fur policy:

We also take pride in the fact that by supporting this sustainable industry we are also supporting Indigenous communities of the Canadian North and their ways of life. Indigenous people have a strong ethical code in their relationship with the animals they hunt for food, clothing, medicines and trade. We strongly identify with the values of these communities, which are based on a profound respect and harmony with nature.

This statement is highly problematic as it uses the language of sustainable industry loosely and blurs the differences between Indigenous subsistence hunting and trapping, practices which are fundamentally different than the White commercialization of producing animal commodities for capitalist consumers who are the demographic market of the expensive jackets (Sorenson 2010). The company claims to support Indigenous people, not only in the website statement but also in the fur policy video. The image of a smiling Indigenous child wearing a fur-trimmed jacket serves as part of a spectacle constructed for the White consumer gaze and reproduces myths that the fur industry is helping Indigenous people by supporting their culture and providing economic opportunities (Figure 103). However, Emberley (1997), Global Action Network, and Sorenson (2010) shatter these myths, arguing that Indigenous people are used as marketing devices for White capitalists to profit from the exploitation of nature. Canada Goose Company claims to respect nature and Indigenous culture, yet this company has a negative impact on the cultures it claims to support. Furthermore, by portraying itself as a saviour of Indigenous cultures, the company masks its dominance and its place as part of a colonialist

structures, as well as glossing over the mass killing of coyotes. Canada Goose claims “for some people wearing fur may be a fashion statement; for Canada Goose fur is a functional part of protecting people from the cold” (Canada Goose Website: April 2012). The people being ‘protected’ are White people and this jacket becomes a mass produced spectacle of commodity racism and commodity speciesism.

After deconstructing some background information on the Canada Goose Company, the contradictions of why this advertisement would appear in Algonquin becomes visible. Firstly, as stated, Canada Goose jackets are made from coyote fur. Similarly to Bruce Peninsula’s commodity representation of coyote pelt souvenirs, Canada Goose employs the rhetoric of ‘pest’ in order to warrant the control and death of coyotes, both these examples constitute cases of violent love. While on the one hand, the coyotes are killed for their fur, on the other their fur is fetishized as worthy of wearing or commodified as a desirable souvenir. Algonquin is presented as one of the world’s most protected wolf spaces with a population of over 300 (*Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park 2002*, Wilson and Heberlein 1996). The presence of coyote fur advertisements at Algonquin is a sharp contradiction, exemplifying spatial contradictions of violent love.

The Canada Goose jacket advertisement at Algonquin is also associated with advertisements for handmade moccasins (in the same advertisement they appear together). Canada Goose strategically used an Indigenous model for the jacket in order to gain an authentic Canadian representation. Further, the linking of Canada Goose with moccasins perpetuates the fur industry myth that this business helps Indigenous people.

The historical roots of the fur trade in Canada are linked to European desire for fur during early ‘settlement’, which led to the establishment of fur trading between the Indigenous people

(Emberley 1997, Preece and Chamberlain 1993). Indigenous populations' use of fur was a relationship of subsistence, whereas Europeans' desire for fur was predominantly for fashion purposes that signified their elite status to others, a mentality central to European capitalism (Emberley 1997, Sorenson 2010). The fur trade created new cultural groups amongst the Indigenous population, as a result of European men pursuing relationships with Indigenous women (Sorenson 2010). Sorenson (2010) reports that Indigenous populations' usefulness was linked to the fur trade and that Europeans would devalue them as the fur trade declined. Moreover, the fur trade significantly shifted Indigenous societies and intensified hierarchical political and economic relationships with Europeans (Sorenson 2010). Non-human animals simultaneously became a burden and exploitable commodity post-European invasion that ceaselessly changed the lives for all animal species (Hollingsworth 1990, Preece and Chamberlain 1993).

The fur trade represents significant destruction and forced assimilation of Indigenous life (Ray 1990, Sorenson 2010). Preece and Chamberlain (1993) argue prior to European invasion, Indigenous people were not involved in fur trading. Further, the fur trade sustained Europeans who brought diseases and traded alcohol that crippled the Indigenous people (Hollingsworth 1990, Preece and Chamberlain 1993). As a result, this further decreased Indigenous populations according to Hollingsworth (1990) as much as "90% due to disease, substance abuse and the socio-cultural upheaval caused by European fur traders". The fur trade and role of the Hudson Bay Company in Canada divorced Indigenous people from their nomadic lifestyle, into trapping that reproduces a hierarchical relationship within the fur industry (Emberley 1997, Hollingsworth 1990, Sorenson 2010). Many of the social ills from the fur trade are part of a continued assault on Indigenous people contemporarily (Hollingsworth 1990, Preece and Chamberlain 1993).

Further, non-human animal populations have suffered from increased exploitation through commercialization of the fur industry from White elites, in addition to the extinction of many species from historic and contemporary over consumption and genocide (Emel 1998, Sorenson 2010).

The fur trade symbolizes a transformation to a capitalist economy that exploits and commodifies humans, animals and nature to expand modernity and secure land/resources from the natural inhabitants (Ray 1990). European justifications to colonize nature through the adoption of the saviour role are justifications adopted, historically and contemporarily, to safeguard the 'White national governor role', as well as maintain a pretence of European innocence concerning the genocides they have inflicted on Indigenous people and non-human animals (Franke 2007, Hage 2000). This historical snapshot of the fur trade demonstrates the significance it has had for the colonization of nature, as well as rendering visible the relationship the extermination of Indigenous people has had to non-human animals for the pursuit of imperial European development.

The violent fur industry employs justifications that it preserves Indigenous culture and tradition; however, this is another means to reinforce the White nation's role as 'savior' from groups who have been demonized as 'inferior' (Preece and Chamberlain 1993, Sorenson 2010). Fur industry advocates argue that the elimination of the fur trade will result in a loss of their "social, spiritual, and cultural relationship with the land and its resources" (Global Action Network). Ironically, many Indigenous communities hold a respectful relationship with animals that is not based on exploitation (Anderson 2004, Global Action Network, Sorenson 2010, Preece and Chamberlain 1993). Further, the commercial fur trade is rooted in a colonial history

between Europeans and Indigenous people that resulted in their subjection (Preece and Chamberlain 1993).

The insidious role of the Hudson Bay Company was a significant oppressor against Indigenous populations that callously forced Indigenous people into a state of subordination and a relationship of dependency (Global Action Network, Ray 1990). White colonialists strongly believed that Indigenous people were their assets to profit from and exploit, whereby George Ray suggested in 1924 “that we must keep them alive for future profits even though we carry them at a loss till such a time shall come” (as cited in Ray 1990:199). Further, as reported in Global Action Network; White imperial fur traders produced narratives of desires for Indigenous people to disappear and be controlled through relations of dependency and enslavement that is exemplified in the following passage: “the sooner the caribou are gone the better, for the more foodstuffs can be imported and the Natives will be forced to trap and become fur producers or starve”. Indigenous people occupy the most devaluing, dangerous and undesirable positions within the fur industry, which is the position of a trapper (Sorenson 2010). This dehumanizing and poorly paid labour is representative of the racial hierarchy within the fur trade that exploits non-White people, while White fashion industries and corporations profit (Emberley 1997, Global Action Network, Sorenson 2010). A former Indigenous Canadian trapper reports “you had a club and bashed the animal’s head. It’s cruel, it’s horrible. People think it’s romantic, but it’s not” (Global Action Network). Moreover, this statement exposes the cruelty of trapping that dismantles the myths of romanticization surrounding fur that Emberley (1997) argues is central to fur companies marketing and advertisements.

Animal exploitation industries are profitable practices, typically controlled by White people, that are not concerned with preserving Indigenous culture and employ Indigenous



identity as a justification to kill animals for White human benefit (Sorenson 2010). The second major myth the fur industry advocates for the continued commercial slaughter of millions of non-human animals is defending the economic importance trapping has for Indigenous communities (Emberley 1997, Global Action Network, Sorenson 2010). Global Action Network confirms this suggesting the Canadian fur industry has “launched an aggressive marketing campaign to convince the public that the fur industry is fundamental to the cultural and economic survival of Indigenous peoples” and this manipulation is an attempt of fur industry advocates to “blur the lines between subsistence living and a polluting, wasteful, commercial industry”. Preece and Chamberlain (1993) argue many fur trade industry advocates defend the fur trade on the grounds that it is necessary and important for the Indigenous lifestyle. However, this ‘defence’ often fails to examine that the commercial exploitation of animals for fur was established during colonialism and contemporarily results in recolonization to Indigenous communities (Preece and Chamberlain 1993). Further, Sorenson (2010) reports that “most Indigenous communities do not depend on hunting and trapping for subsistence” and only a small “percentage of the industry’s huge profits goes to Indigenous trappers” (31). According to Global Action Network, only approximately one percent of the \$800 million dollar annual industry is distributed to Indigenous trappers. The annual profits on average earned from fur trapping are argued to be in the range of \$225 to \$700 depending on the source of information (Global Action Network, Hollingsworth 1990, Sorenson 2010). Preece and Chamberlain (1993) report that in 1989, a farmed (commercialization) white fox pelt was worth approximately \$62.00, while a trapped (Indigenous positions in the fur industry) pelt was only valued at \$13.00. Further, only approximately 2-5% of the Indigenous population is involved in the fur industry in Canada (Global Action Network). Emberley (1997) and Global Action Network argue that if fur

consumers were restricted to purchase fur from Indigenous people, the global capitalist fur industry would collapse.

White capitalists (i.e. Canada Goose Company) routinely exploit Indigenous tradition through commodity racism in order to sell and justify to the White nation animal commodities that are not reflective of the Indigenous community. The fur trade is a useful lens to critique interlocking oppressions of Indigenous people and non-human animals. Moreover, the fur trade demonstrates that speciesism and colonialism are not only interconnected but rather constitute one another as what Kim (2011) calls ‘interlocking structures of domination’. Indigenous people and non-human animals are both to be managed and controlled in order to generate profit for the fur industry. Colonialism and the enslavement from the fur trade for Indigenous people are directly linked to White speciesist attitudes of killing non-human animals for fur. These speciesist attitudes result in Indigenous subordination into the fur trade and a life of trapping. The centrality to national identity of these dual forms of oppression can be identified in the fact that Canada’s national symbol is a beaver, featured on the nickel coin, reminding critical observers of how the beaver pelt became a fetish commodity for the White gaze (Sorenson 2010).

My discussion of the marketing of moccasins as another kind of fetish object has not only explored the invisibility of the legacy of exploitation associated with the fur industry and Indigenous people, it also has exposed the harms associated with the trapping industry. Trapping is the most devalued position within the fur industry. Also a number of negative health implications are associated with handling and ingesting dangerous chemicals used in tanning and preserving animal skin and fur commodities.

The fact that the fur trim on moccasins and the shoe itself are made from animal skins is an explicit example of violent love towards non-human animals and a striking contradiction within the wilderness experience. While wildlife viewing opportunities are central to the wilderness experience, simultaneously many of the same animals who are under intense surveillance from the tourist gaze and subject to the ‘gawk’ are the same animals’ bodies that are killed and transformed into commodity fetishes, such as moccasins. This contradiction is most strongly apparent within Algonquin, since in this Park space there is a stronger narrative of wildlife protection in comparison to Bruce Peninsula. For example, most moccasins were reported to be made from moose or deer hide and the fur was overwhelmingly from rabbits. This provides strong evidence to support my arguments about violent love. While moose are among the most sought-after and photographed mammals in Algonquin, their skin is simultaneously sold as a commodity in the same space and presumably is purchased by some of the same wildlife enthusiasts who would be thrilled to see a moose in their natural habitat. This example highlights the contradictory, complicated and messy relationships we (Canadians) express towards animals.

Moccasins are a commodity fetish item that encompasses three important themes that have been articulated thus far including: commodity racism, commodity speciesism and a journey of panoptical time (McClintock 1995). They are mass-produced as ‘trendy’ fashion items sold at large malls in cities and at the time of writing are popular among students at university campuses. They are also ‘souvenirs’ sold at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula gift shops. The representation of moccasins through the lens of commodity racism suggests Indigenous culture has been transformed into a commodity item of consumption that continues the effects of colonization, as White people continue to profit from the subordination of

Indigenous people. Fur sewn on the moccasins is figurative of humans' speciesist relationship with non-human animals and their desire to conquer wild animals and transform them into commodities (Figure 104). Further, the presence of fur trim on the moccasins is symbolic of the fur trade, as genocide against non-human animals and a cultural genocide of Indigenous people that destroyed their way of living and marks the emergence of new social problems, as a consequence of Europeans trading alcohol and weapons for fur (Hollingsworth 1990). Moccasins are an interesting commodity item to analyze as they demonstrate the White desire to consume items that represent the wild and free, while at the same time wearing moccasins can be a vehicle to reaffirm racial and human supremacy (Emberley 1997).

McClintock's concept of panoptical time can be understood through the deconstruction of moccasins. They are transformed into a spectacle, which represents global history (fur trade and colonization) that is worn by the White consumer who occupies a privileged colonial position of invisibility (McClintock 1995). Further, moccasins symbolize the conquering of nature and the domestication of the feared 'other', in this case both wild animals and Indigenous people who are constructed as a threat to White privilege and the project of modernity. The White fantasy is constructed to maintain dominance through the consumption of 'otherness' from commodity fetishists (Emberley 1997, Hage 2000).

Both Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula in its entirety produce a theme of Indigenousness and wildlife appearing relationally (they are reduced together to one meaning) in order to produce the wilderness experience. Nature parks are about experiencing and expecting the opportunity to view individuals and see things that deviate from their everyday. Everything sold or displayed in a gift shop is intentional. All items sold in these spaces contribute to manufacturing nature park fantasies that include producing commodities of wildlife with

Indigenous people/culture within a constructed wilderness space that are all synonymous with experiencing the Canadian wilderness. Souvenirs are not passive purchases. They reproduce a power dynamic between the tourist (colonizer) and spectacles at the receiving end of the gaze (colonized). This contributes to the self identification process and reaffirms an individual's place in the social world in a colonized landscape. Gift shops are fundamentally about difference. They reproduce negative stereotypes about Indigenous populations that reflect Eurocentric attitudes and we create fantasy representations of animals, such as the comedian bear. Thus far, I have been building a larger argument of challenging progress and fantasies of post-colonialism. Next, I directly challenge fantasies that we live in a post-colonial world.

### ***Visitor Center Museums: Progress, Post-colonialism and Taxidermy***

Things change, but don't really change (Johnson 2012)

Space can be made to hide consequences from us, how relations of power and discipline are inscribed into the apparently innocent spatiality of social life (Soja 1989:6).

Soja's (1989) critique of space obscuring power relations has been a dominant theme of my research. Critical analysis reveals that the sanitized spaces of Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are perpetually reproducing power differences between the tourist and what is viewed as part of the wilderness landscape (Indigenous people/culture, wildlife and nature). In the sections above, I revealed many spatial contradictions. These spatial contradictions are concealed through spatial organization and management in order to maintain wilderness fantasies. Both Parks reproduce unequal power relations that are disguised by narratives of rescue and conservation within what I call an *imaginary space of protection*. However, the visitor centers (also I refer to them as museums) most explicitly reproduce colonial relations between animals and Indigenous populations.

According to Hill (2007) a museum is “a collection of dead things” that he describes as a graveyard (212). They include large assortments of cultural artifacts and construct snapshots of history that are intended to enhance education and appreciation of our Canadian heritage, typically employing a narrative of wilderness. Importantly, museums emphasize the narrative of progress and recreate the fantasy of harmony and respect for groups who have suffered from the colonial project.

### *Painting the Nation*

At both Parks, a continual theme in images and paintings of the landscape is that of emptiness. Cronin (2011) reports that the representation of Jasper as an empty landscape in visual images and tourist postcards is one of the leading contributors that influence the construction of ‘wilderness’ spaces and as a result shapes the illusion that such spaces are immune to ecological consequences. Fantasies of empty land are not simply a contemporary idea. These fantasies can be traced to the development of the Canadian identity that was a nationalist project undertaken by the Group of Seven in the early 1900s (King 2010). Jessup (2007) argues the Group of Seven were highly influential in constructing the mythology of Canada as an untamed wilderness. The Group of Seven refers to a number of White men who painted landscapes of the Canadian wilderness with goals of creating an identity for Canada (King 2010). Canada has a complicated history; Francis (1997) and King (2010) suggest Canadians lack a shared collective history of the past, including: rituals, myths and heroes. Canada was colonized by Britain and France, displacing Indigenous populations by purchasing (often in unfair ways) or stealing Indigenous land (King 2010). Further, Canada was developed as a nation by exploiting immigrant labour, such as employing Chinese workers to build the railway in Western Canada. Moreover, what it meant to be Canadian and what constituted

Canada according to King (2010), was often confusing and loosely defined. As a result of the messy creation of Canada that is grounded in disputes over land and colonization of the Indigenous people, a sanitized version of the creation story and symbolism of Canada as an empty wilderness was adopted in order to eliminate anxieties over a history of conflict.

Hill (2007) argues that “art” is typically understood as White art, more specifically that which is produced by and for male White elites. At Algonquin the Group of Seven are strongly represented, since many of the paintings that became synonymous with the Canadian nation were painted in the Park. Tom Thompson, one of the most famous painters associated with Canadian identity and the Group of Seven, painted many popular landscapes within Algonquin. Thompson is more celebrated than any other individual (human and non-Indigenous) within Algonquin: there is a memorial spot inside the Park, statues of his face and commodities for sale that feature his name. While there is much more that could be mentioned/critiqued about the Group of Seven and the construction of national identity, I am more interested in the absence of Indigenous people within the landscapes and the continued representation in paintings of Canada as empty for White discovery.

Hill (2007) provides a critical perspective on museums and gift shops, specifically at the McMichael Canadian Art Collection center. His perspective is significant for my critique of empty landscape images, since he provides an Indigenous viewpoint. He argues that to be “Canadian means White Canadians” (Hill 2007:215). Art created by the Group of Seven of the Canadian spirit is unreflective of the cultural diversity of Canada’s history including Indigenous, British and French populations, which reconfirms Hage’s arguments that white settler nations are organized around the White fantasy.

Algonquin features many paintings by Tom Thompson in the visitor center, yet none of the famous paintings have humans in them. Further, I observed that Indigenous art is often segregated and turned into a souvenir for its difference, rather than as a respectable painting, such as is the case for the Group of Seven's work. Indigenous people have been removed from the landscape, except for when, according to Crosby (2007), "difference is a sellable commodity" for the tourist gaze at the gift shop or inside museums (219). Hill (2007) argues Indigenous people are perpetually absent from the Group of Seven's landscapes. Further, the idea of wilderness to Hill is unimaginable, since he views these White manufactured wilderness spaces as territories of his people. This theme of empty land and connection to Canadian identity of the Group of Seven is significant to this research, since while the wilderness identity is being created in Park spaces it is simultaneously destroying and erasing an important part of Canadian history.

At both Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula the idea of absence (excluding Indigenous people in representation) in park-making is a fantasy that lets us avoid responsibility and allows us to be negligent in confronting our colonial practices, including the violence and abusive policies inflicted on Indigenous people. There is a national myth that Canadians are 'peacekeepers' and this helps us to fantasize and to identify ourselves as innocent and sympathetic to Indigenous people, rather than viewing ourselves as agents in the cultural genocide of Indigenous populations (Francis 1997, Razack 2004). Jessup (2002) argues the erasure of Indigenous historical presence in art is a practice of denial of historical atrocities and contemporary political problems with Indigenous people. She notes this representation contributes to their ongoing exclusion (Jessup 2002). The widespread practice of failing to include Indigenous populations in paintings of Canada is an example of the continued fantasy for



Indigenous people to disappear from White contact. Yet, despite the aggressive assimilation policies, cuts in government social spending and negligent police services in the search for the more than 500 missing women in Canada, Indigenous people continue to live in Canada, however for the most part they are contained on reserves, in remote areas with poor land quality and impoverished urban areas (Amnesty International Canada, Balfour and Comack 2006, Culhane 2009, McGill 2008). When Indigenous people/culture do ‘appear’ they are almost never represented as real people. These fantasies are highly complex and can be analyzed through Hage’s (2000) lens of the White nation fantasy. According to Hage (2000), this fantasy is a vision of a nation governed by White people. Hage (2000) argues “both White racists and White multiculturalists share in a conception of themselves as nationalists and of the nation as a space structured around White culture, where Indigenous people and non-White ‘ethnics’ are merely national objects to be moved or removed according to a White national will” (18). While there is a conscious effort for Indigenous people to be controlled there is simultaneously an association of Indigenous people/culture with Canadian national mythology, yet they “must be kept categorically separate from it as well” (Hill 2007:215). Our relationship with Indigenous people is highly complicated and is strongly associated with building a White nation and when we cannot make Indigenous people disappear, we create other fantasies of inferiority to silence their resistance.

### *Visitor Centers: a Colonial Space*

Wakeham (2008) argues museums offer a sight of spectacle and are institutions for maintaining colonial power. Museums are sites for Dubinsky (2004) and Urry’s (2002) ‘tourist gaze’ and McClintock’s (1995) panoptical time, commodity racism and what I call commodity speciesism. Both Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula have visitor centers/museums for tourists to

visit, photograph and consume knowledge of the wilderness identity. Rose (2012) adopts a discourse analysis rooted in Foucauldian thinking and suggests that a 'visitor' can be referred to as "an eye, someone who sees, and, through seeing, understands in specific ways" (251). Further, museums are spaces where middle-class individuals are able to distinguish themselves in comparison to other social groups (Rose 2012, Wakeham 2008). According to Baker (2002), Algonquin is a space occupied by middle-class Canadians. Parks are not White spaces by coincidence. Unequal utilization of nature has been identified by Byrne and Wolch (2009) as a result of socioeconomic barriers.

During my visits to the Parks, I observed that most (not all) visitors were White. This is significant as White visitors in a white settler nation are in a privileged social position to be evaluators of socially constructed differences and what Whites refer to as progress. "Who is doing the visiting?" is a question that should always be considered when analyzing colonial places, such as museums. Also, critical attention should be directed towards the knowledge producers of the visitor center at the Parks. While Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are spaces where power and discipline operate in all areas within the Parks, the visitor center is where there is the most evidence of discipline, regulation and surveillance. The visitor centers are symbols of colonialism and White control over others (animals and Indigenous people). Firstly, de Leeuw (2011) argues physical landscapes of buildings produce relations of power. She applies this framework of analysis to the infrastructural design of residential schools, suggesting they are symbols of White conquest. The visitor centers at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are representations of western development. While all the buildings within the Parks are a sign of power and domination, the visitor centers are large structures that stand-out and are highly visible in a 'wilderness' space. The visitor centers symbolize imperialism as they are much larger

than any other building in the Park that demonstrates the White ability to control, tame and manage nature and populations (Indigenous and non-human animals).

Rose (2012) argues museums are intended to be an educational spectacle. The visitor centers at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are constructed as sites for tourists to consume knowledge about Canadian heritage, wildlife and ecology. The rescue mission is heavily emphasized within the visitor centers through the Parks providing literature near exhibits about the Parks role in preserving populations, land and restoring Indigenous cultural artifacts. This leads tourists to believe that Canadians (meaning non-Indigenous and more specifically White people) have adopted a heroic stewardship role. However, the narrative of rescue only masks complex and contradictory relationships/attitudes. Rationales that visitor centers are harmless spaces and education centers should be viewed with scepticism and criticism, since the power and discipline that operates within this space functions to reproduce colonial logic and the normalization of White progress. Also, it is important to mention museums produce sanitized versions of history and contribute to truth claim-making, as a result of the legitimacy that museums have accumulated.

### *Taxidermy Representation and Colonialism*

Museums romanticize and naturalize historical atrocities that spotlight victims as spectacles to be consumed, White spectators are fascinated with ‘otherness’ and project their “fetishistic colonial gaze” (Wakeham 2008:4). Further, hierarchies of race and species is normalized as their bodies are positioned in the museum as evolutionarily inferior in presentations that treat White supremacy as a biological construction of fitness versus bodies of the ‘wild’ (Wakeham 2008). Power and discipline are executed and documented through the taxidermy exhibits within Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. Presumably, these visitor centers are

attempting to produce knowledge and education about individuals we (Whites) do not associate with ourselves. All of the animals in the visitor center were real living animals at one time who have been transformed into taxidermy. There are many people who believe that taxidermy or what Angela Singer refers to as ‘de-taxiderming’ is art (*Antennae Magazine: Botched Taxidermy*, Autumn 2008). Wakeham (2008) explores “taxidermy as the preservation, stuffing and mounting of animal skins for display” and links this practice to the “politics of colonial conquest, materializing western fantasies of mastery over the natural world and control of unruly, ‘wild’ bodies” (back cover).

The taxidermy animals at Algonquin have been reconstructed in an environment that simulates where they would appear if outside the visitor center (Figure 105). Further, there is written information and voice recordings of the animals in order to heighten the experience of close contact with wildlife that is not often possible in urban communities. Tourists can view and experience the taxidermic specimens in a simulated natural environment at a safe distance. Investigating distance is important when evaluating attitudes towards wildlife, more specifically predator animals including wolves and bears. Research has revealed that distance influences attitudes expressed towards wolves, as noted in the literature review. Karlsson and Sjöström (2007) and Kellert, Black, Rush and Bath (1995) report that individuals who live closer to wolf territories express more negative attitudes than individuals who reside in urban areas that would experience less wolf viewing opportunities. However, as I discuss in **Chapter Six**, recently this distance in urban cities has been disrupted and the reactions have been negative.

There is a nostalgic dream to encounter a bear or wolf at Algonquin, yet most people want to view predator species from a safe distance, either from their car or canoe. Viewing wildlife in a socially constructed wilderness space contributes to wilderness fantasies and

expectations of wildlife belonging in these specific spaces. The visitor center shortens and disrupts this distance and allows visitors to gaze at animal subjects they define as majestic or powerful. Bear and wolf taxidermy are popular exhibits in the museum that allow visitors to participate in what Lemelin (2006) calls the ‘gawk, glance, and gaze’ at the animals at the leisure of the tourist. During my research visit to the museum, an individual at the bear exhibit turned to me and stated “at least I can leave saying I saw a bear”. While viewing bears in close proximity for most individuals is not desirable, a taxidermy bear is an acceptable and safe way for tourists to admire bears at Algonquin. Wolves are another popular exhibit where individuals can view a wolf pack in the howling position and listen to an automated howl feature (Figure 106).

Grambo and Cox (2008) explore the transformation in social attitudes towards wolves from legend, enemy to icon. According to Jones (2002), this dramatic shift in social attitudes spiked in the 1960s and as a result has led to a more stabilized wolf population in North America, yet Canada has a much more abundant population. However, this ‘change in heart’ towards wolves regrettably was adopted too late for the many populations who became extinct that occupied much of the Canadian and American landscape prior to European colonization (Jones 2002).

Within nature park spaces wolves became ambassadors and celebrations of environmental conservation efforts. The discourse at Algonquin aids in demystifying myths about wolves, suggesting they operate an essential role to the ecosystem of the Algonquin ‘wilderness’ (*Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park 2002*). Park literature producers continuously defend wolves’ carnivorous eating habits, reporting this as a natural cycle (*Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park 2002*). In *Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park (2002)*, there is an example that shifts the eating of others’ flesh onto humans, noting that many

humans eat animals although slaughterhouse workers do the killing, whereas wolves do it themselves in order to survive. This is an interesting comparison that has the effect of normalizing human consumption of other animals and ignores the socially constructed relations we have created with them.

Algonquin has become world renowned for the maintenance- of a healthy, stable and relatively large wolf population. In fact, Algonquin is an essential space for research on wolves, in addition to the fact that wolves are a major source of tourism capital. Unique to Algonquin are the public wolf howl events that are held every Thursday evening in the month of August. Public wolf howls originated in 1960 and involve numerous people, a reported average of 1377 individuals per outing,-who travel with a naturalist to imitate wolf howls aiming for a response (*Wolf Howling in Algonquin Provincial Park 2004*). This is an important historical shift for wolves as this marked the beginning of changing social attitudes towards them. Wolves at Algonquin were no longer persecuted and instead became a symbol of the wilderness experience, evoking high levels of fascination and romanticism among tourists. Moreover, wolves at Algonquin are the ultimate attraction and to see or hear a wolf is one of the most significant experiences of the wilderness an individual can enjoy.

While there is much information that could be reported about the positive representation of wolves and many other mammals within Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula, I now reveal the discipline that also operates within these same spaces. On the one hand, taxidermy is advocated at the Parks as a source of education to teach people about wild animals. Taxidermy is presented as involving natural death and harmless display of animal spectacles for the tourist gaze. Firstly, this naturalization ignores questions of how the animals who have been transformed into taxidermic specimens died or were intentionally killed for a museum attraction. Secondly,

taxidermy is an example of a violent love relationship between the tourist and animal specimens. While on the one hand, individuals admire and enjoy taxidermic animals, perhaps because these individuals identify as animal or wilderness lovers, the context in which the animals are viewed is entangled in relations of violence, discipline and colonialism.

Taxidermy is explicitly an act of control and domination over specific social groups that reinforces relations of power through the normalization of humans' (Euro-Canadian) conquest over animals. Wakeham (2008) argues taxidermy is a form of colonial representation. More specifically, she argues taxidermy aids in securing identity and is a "symbol of White male mastery over nature and the power to control the forces of racial and social decay" (Wakeham 2008:13). As identified by Wakeham (2008) taxidermy contributes to identity-making for the White colonial gaze and is a spectacle of difference. Further, the taxidermy at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula reinforce the illusory dualism between humans and animals, whereby these spaces allow individuals to juxtapose their progress through the evaluation of constructed differences. Darwin argues human and species differences are a matter of degree, rather than kind (Bekoff 2007). Constructing differences and dualisms between animals and humans is essential to human-making (Bulbeck 2005, Fudge 2002). Taxidermy as a mode of discipline under the control of White management warrants scrutiny, since the disguise of rescue and education conceals the violence embedded in these relations.

Animals are not the only specimens that have been transformed from living to dead taxidermy attractions at Algonquin. Wakeham (2008) examines taxidermic representation of Indigenous people. She argues Indigenous people have been recreated in a similar way to taxidermic animals through representation as a plastic mannequin for the White museum gaze. While Indigenous culture/people are dominant themes in both Parks, Bruce Peninsula has more

Indigenous artifacts (as opposed to taxidermy) than Algonquin, which may be influenced by the status of Bruce Peninsula as a National Park. However, Algonquin has an ‘Indigenous exhibit’ that is highly problematic for multiple reasons.

Similar to gift shops Indigenous people as a group are often represented in White public imagination as Francis’s (1992) ‘imaginary Indian’. They are represented stereotypically; wearing animal skins, furs, and untamed hair, as well as, lacking standards of White cleanliness (Figure 107). Gender stereotypes are reinforced in the Indigenous exhibit. At Algonquin male plastic ‘Indians’ are represented as the warrior hunter (Figure 108). The female is depicted as passive and presumably grooming herself, reinforcing the gendered self discipline of beauty (Figure 109). The third individual in the Algonquin visitor center exhibit is an elder Indigenous man. He is represented as inferior and degenerate according to White standards, since the plastic ‘Indian’ older man is missing teeth and appears psychologically unstable in comparison to the younger male mannequin or female (Figure 110). Further, the reconstructed theme of how Indigenous people supposedly lived/live is a contained nature setting with a canoe and no modern technological advancements (Figure 111). These types of representations reinforce stereotypes of primitiveness associated with nature, and progress with civilization. Overall, they are transformed into what I would describe as *Avatar like*, meaning they are represented as large and atavistic (inferior and evolutionary throwbacks). The exhibit reinforces racist stereotypes of Indigenous people and allows White tourists to juxtapose their position of superiority and domination over a culture that is represented as dead/disappearing. Also, in the Algonquin display all three taxidermic ‘Indians’ are subordinately positioned through the arrangement of the mannequins as always sitting on the ground/stone and never standing. We must remember that the reconstruction of the exhibit is carefully designed by Park managers. Representing



Indigenous people in subordinate positions may be a conscious or unconscious result of internalized ideas about Indigenous people as inferior and as Wakeham (2008) examines are often categorized with animals, assuming from a speciesist perspective this would be a negative association.

A noteworthy aspect of this exhibit is that Indigenous people are represented as a disappearing population. As Wakeham (2008) suggests, taxidermy of both animals and Indigenous people is both an artistic pursuit to imitate nature and a scientific project to collect and preserve natural history. Here, Indigenous people are represented as people/culture in need of saving from extinction, since they are often missing from many everyday landscapes and discourses. Francis (1992) also argues that Indigenous people are often treated “as historic figures of legend and myth rather than citizens of the twenty-first century” (240). This is significant since Indigenous people are still very much a part of Canada. However, many of them have been segregated to reserves, and individuals who do come to urban areas endure numerous challenges and discrimination within a White society (Razack 2002). Their resistance as living agents is almost always silenced, as I demonstrate in **Chapter Six**.

This exhibit is an example of what Pratt (1992) refers to as the anti-conquest, where European subjects can “secure their innocence in the same moment as they assert European hegemony” (9). Individuals can simultaneously express love, hate, disgust and pity. These mixed emotions of entering a contact zone with plastic ‘Indians’ are a result of what Dubinsky (2004) identifies as an accumulation of imperial guilt, “genuine compassion or the reinscription of racism” that is only possible because of the imagined silence of the disciplined group (Indigenous people) (228). A dominant task of my research has been to challenge the innocence of naturalized national myths that operate in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. These myths

involve what Wakeham (2008) calls *discourses of the vanishing Indian* in Canada and the United States; these emerged in the 1900s during a time-period of White racial anxieties in the wider social context of nation building. Further, this fantasy of disappearance is embedded within White fears of the racialized other (Wakeham 2008). While museums are typically collections of dead individuals, plastic Indians are the exception since they have not all disappeared despite aggressive policies against them. Therefore the narrative of disappearance is more accurately a fantasy that fits the overarching regime of Algonquin to deliver the fantasy wilderness experience.

### *Animality and Indigeneity*

Wakeham (2008) conducts a provocative analysis of taxidermy as a sign system that conflates ‘animality and Indigeneity’ within imperial and colonial narratives of extinction. This conflation is significant to investigate, as the spectacle of a mannequin Indigenous person in close proximity to a stuffed wild animal reconfirms Emel’s (1998) comparison of the eradication of wolves to the colonization of Indigenous people in North America. Emel (1998) argues the similar genocide is to benefit White people and ensure their domination through the construction of western dualisms of nature versus civilization. Moreover, the pairing of wild animals and Indigenous people/cultural items at museums is interesting, as this positioning parallels their similar colonization by White people.

Western dualisms create binaries and sites to juxtapose oneself in comparison to the ‘other’ that conflicts with the ‘dominant’ western worldview (Emel 1998, Kim 2011). Moreover, sets of dualisms have shaped the dominant group’s violent treatment towards ‘others’ who have been demonized as ‘inferior’ (Emel 1998, Patterson 2002). Further, these are mutually reinforcing and reproduce power relationships continuously through dualistic thinking (Kim

2011). Franke (2007) exposes the early justifications in his critical analysis of self-determination rights of Indigenous people. He claims early Europeans of the 'New World' warranted their 'civilizing mission', by suggesting it was morally defensible to 'civilize' the 'uncivilized' that lived in a 'state of nature' of lawlessness, without a social contract and civil society (Franke 2007). Colonialism was a contestation between what "has been perceived as the modern versus the traditional" (Franke 2007:366). Moreover, the myth of empty land was constructed to defend European intervention and occupation of Indigenous land as an effort to aid in 'modernizing' and 'rescuing' the people categorized as 'primitive and inferior' (Franke 2007). The narrative of the White saviour emerged to provide ethical momentum for European people to colonize Indigenous land and the inhabitants of the region; Briggs (2003) and Franke (2007) argue the 'saviour' discourse provided a rationale for western intervention. As a result, the narrative produced by colonist advocates to rescue and civilize Indigenous people served as a justification for the violence, genocide and displacement of all forms of natural life (Franke 2007).

The genocide of Indigenous people was often paralleled by genocide of non-human animals and exploitation of nature. Emel (1998) argues that the killing of colonized people and animal life during the Victorian era was a project to eliminate any threats to settlement through imperialist and colonialist strategies of violence. Emel deconstructs the relationship between the colonization of Indigenous people and wolves that symbolizes resistance and threats to modernity. Specifically, Emel (1998) investigates the interrelationship of the eradication of the wolf in the United States with "racism, sexism, animal abuse and economic practices" (93). Wolves were stigmatized as a threat to resources that European colonizers intended to invade and conquer for personal use (Emel 1998). Shortly after the arrival of Europeans, the buffalo were over hunted predominantly for sport but also for their hides, a big business, which threatened the

survival of Indigenous Americans to use the hide for tepees, eat the meat for food and importantly for exchange between goods with the Europeans (Emel 1998). As a result, the demise of buffalo was a defeat for Indigenous populations that pushed them from their traditional way of living into reservations and confined areas (Emel 1998). Wolves were portrayed by the colonizers as a hindrance to the advancement and profit growth for European capitalists (Emel 1998). Further, wolves were accused of killing buffalo and livestock that aided in gaining support to warrant the wolf genocide (Emel 1998).

Exploring the historical significance of the eradication of wolves and colonization of Indigenous people reveals the similarities between the two that signify difference and threats to the colonial project to secure land and investment (Emel 1998). Mirroring Franke's (2007) arguments that extermination of Indigenous populations was sanctioned by the colonizers in 'natural law', Emel (1998) reports wolf killing was an institutionally sanctioned practice celebrated through anthropocentric terms to enhance the lives of humans at the expense of animals lives. Moreover, Indigenous people and non-human animals both have undergone an experience of genocide and spatial containment/segregation from colonization and the expansion of modernity. The myth of progress and naturalizing language of destruction neutralizes historical atrocities and continued colonial practices. This narrative of progress maintains White privilege and allows White people to continue to be unaccountable for their violence inflicted on nature's inhabitants.

Therefore exhibits of colonized groups should never be viewed as an innocent tourist attraction, since they are rooted in historical colonial relations and continued struggles inside and outside the fantasy space of Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. The Indigenous exhibit at Algonquin is an example of McClintock's panoptical time, whereby global history can be

consumed at a glance by tourists of the visitor center that secures White and human supremacy. More specifically, the pairing of animal fur and Indigenous people in the same exhibit and placing Indigenous people and wildlife together in the entire space of the visitor center demonstrates how they are spectacles of global defeat and fantasies for White individuals that groups perceived as impediments to progress and civilization have been controlled, tamed and domesticated for the desires of the White dominant group.

Kim (2011) and Patterson (2002) argue there is a pattern of animalizing people to warrant the treatment of dehumanized groups throughout history, such as Indigenous people, African Americans, Japanese and Jewish people in order to maintain White supremacy. Patterson (2002) offers critical insight on the social construction of otherness in comparison to the dominant European worldview. He also reports the historical linguistic constructions that animalized racial groups, which aided in justifying their treatment as a consequence of deep historical roots of exploiting non-human animals in order to maintain human supremacy (Patterson 2002). Further, the plastic 'Indian' mannequin and stuffed animals in a museum entrench the notion that these two groups are trapped in a primitive state, whereas White people are on the viewing end of the tourist gaze observing the museum exhibits through what Mary Pratt refers to as 'imperial eyes' (Dubinsky 2004, Franke 2007, Pratt 1992, Wakeham 2008). The imagery in the museum suggests there is a co-existence amongst animals that in the natural world would hold an oppositional relationship of prey and predator. This representation is a symbolic one that reinforces the 'White fantasy' of the false harmonious relationship White people have with non-White people and non-human animals.

The narrative of extinction is a significant discourse that Wakeham (2008) considers in her understanding of taxidermic signs and views this as a continuous colonial project that

naturalizes death and disappearances of Indigenous people, as well as animals that masks colonial violence. Buffalo heads mounted on a museum wall are symbolic of their historical defeat that is linked to colonialism, genocide and animal exploitation (Wakeham 2008). This animal species is extinct and the stuffed dead buffalo becomes a spectacle of sympathy, while at the same time the tourist travels through ‘panoptical time’ and presumes their extinction to be a normal unfolding of history (McClintock 1995, Wakeham 2008). Museums are master narratives of social progress to the White tourists who visit them (Wakeham 2008). Furthermore, they represent a White fantasy of history and naturalize social ordering that maintains White innocence (Wakeham 2008).

Nothing in the Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula museum is ‘natural’ and these spaces are entangled in relations of domination. While many people may believe visitor centers/museums are spaces of education, appreciation and rescuing individuals we identify with our Canadian identity and history, this fantasy is much more complex. Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are fantasy spaces that are entrenched with the narrative of rescue and progress that assumes we have transcended our insidious colonial history. Firstly, at Algonquin the most famous mammal is the wolf, which was also once the most despised and persecuted animal in North America. This representation of wolf progress may lead people to believe that wolves are a restored and respected species, when these attitudes are, instead, spatial. Indigenous people/culture are represented in accordance with how White individuals imagine them, a process that reinforces many negative stereotypes of socially constructed differences that thereafter shape public attitudes and social policies.

This section has attempted to disrupt myths of progress and perceptions of post-colonialism. Contrary to popular belief, what has been socially constructed as progress is highly

complicated and does not follow a non-interrupted linear pathway. My research has exposed contradictions and violent love relations in different spaces within Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula with the aim of understanding the challenges to our 'progress' obsessed society. While inclusion of Indigenous people/culture (commodities and taxidermy) at the Parks may appear to uncritical non-Indigenous observers to be a positive advancement; Crosy (2007) an Indigenous woman, argues that the appropriation and White colonization of Indigenous culture for White desires and fantasies is a new type of colonialism. Taxidermy is assumed to be natural, however this intense control over animal bodies is evidence of the deep speciesist attitudes humans express towards animals. The practices of new colonialism that circulate within Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula towards non-human animals and Indigenous people are more insidious than the casual observer may assume. Now, colonial logic has been carefully concealed through narratives of rescue adopted in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula, in addition to the colonizing through transformation into commodities and dead specimens.

### **Part One and Part Two: The Wilderness Experience Chapter Summary**

These two chapters have provided an investigation of the extent to which violent love and contradictions exist at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. Connected with this dominant narrative is the conflation of animals with Indigenous people in order to manufacture nature park fantasies. These chapters have revealed that violent love is highly complex and themes of loving and hating simultaneously are consistent within many different spaces at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. The contradictions within the Parks are endless and selection of what to include was challenging.

Firstly, I revealed spatial contradictions that exist at the Parks; more specifically I focused my analysis on Algonquin. Algonquin has been constructed as a wilderness space, yet

out of sight from tourists, logging takes place that provides 20% of the timber for Ontario residents. Logging practices remain uncontested by nature advocates and tourists, since Park managers carefully maintain the space to ensure there is invisibility of exploitation. I also disrupt the protection narrative fantasy at Algonquin. Many people assume wildlife is protected in spaces, such as Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. However, in specific areas of Algonquin hunting and trapping is permitted. Also, invisible boundaries of the Park are problematic, since many Algonquin wolves leave the Park in the winter to seek deer and as a result are vulnerable to being killed. Another contradiction is that only some fish are awarded protection in a few select sanctuaries, while other fish are subject to persecution and direct consumption by tourists in order to further enhance their 'wilderness' experience. I also explored the celebration of meat culture that becomes synonymous with wilderness and masculinity. The example of fishing at Algonquin and meat-eating demonstrates the entrenchment of speciesism and the normalization of a hierarchy of animals, whereby some are worthy of consideration (shifts according to spatial belonging), while others are deemed inferior or constructed as living for purely human benefit. Next, I examined the contradiction of the Park's role in claiming to protect wildlife and the environment, while simultaneously the consequences of tourism in many ways destroy the land or result in the discipline of wildlife labeled as habituated or 'problem' bears. The terms nature or wilderness park are themselves a contradiction, since this discourse perpetuates the myth there is a culture-nature divide that creates fantasies of parks as protected, resulting in the invisibility of human consequences on the landscape and non-human species.

Capitalism is critiqued through the lens of violent love within Algonquin. While many people flee the city to 'wilderness' spaces during the summer months in Ontario, in order to escape the alienation and abuses of capitalism, there is evidence that many individuals do not



wish to give up all of their luxuries during their wilderness experience. Moreover, a contradiction emerges with individuals attempting to escape modernity, yet simultaneously desiring the benefits of capitalism. Corporate commodities have also entered wilderness spaces and constitute environmental contradictions, for example Pepsi pop machines. The Algonquin Logging Museum is critiqued as it normalizes the project of imperialism and nation building through the narrative of White progress. National myths of progress are contradicted by the discontentment individuals express with capitalism that may motivate many to travel to nature park spaces.

Representations of wildlife and Indigenous people inside the gift shops demonstrate contradictory attitudes and exemplify a new type of exploitation, referred to as commodity racism and commodity speciesism. Many animals are commodified anthropomorphically. This is linked to socially constructed ideas about non-human animals and is symbolic of the fantasies humans have created about them. Wolves are the only mammal that has not been commodified in anthropomorphic ways at the two Parks under investigation. Instead they are represented as wild and belonging in the Algonquin wilderness, rather than trivialized, as is the case with bears, another predator animal that resides in the landscape. While non-human animals are commodified into various souvenirs, their bodies are also sold within the same space that claims to protect and advocate for them that is a strong example of violent love.

Indigenous people/culture are also heavily commodified within Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. They are continuously represented in commodities in ways that appeal to White consumers and reinforce stereotypes of Indigenous people that are manufactured through fantasy-making. Indigenous people/culture similarly are represented as synonymous with the wilderness experience and are symbolic of the Canadian national identity. Wildlife and Indigenous people/culture are often produced relationally and appear together as one commodity.

This represents colonial defeat and control of ‘others’ who Whites deem threatening and in need of control in order to ensure the White colonial project remains intact. Moccasins are an explicit example of violent love, as demonstrated by my critical deconstruction of what they literally are and symbolize, such as the fur trade and legacy of colonialism against non-human animals and Indigenous populations. Further, they illustrate the theme of animals and Indigenous people/culture being conflated that I examine through a colonial lens and are examples of new forms of racism and speciesism that mainly remain unexamined. Contrary to popular perceptions that souvenir commodities are innocent products, I have revealed through my investigation of the gift shops at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula that there are many contradictory representations that are embedded within souvenirs. Purchasing commodities of other individuals is not a passive activity that instead continually reproduces power relations and reinforces the idea that White humans belong in this space.

The visitor centers are also critiqued for the myths of post-colonialism they produce, while securing White human hegemony simultaneously. I analyzed the importance of the absence of Indigenous people in images located in Algonquin and painted at Algonquin by the Group of Seven. The visual iconology of Canada as a vast wilderness continues contemporarily to be the symbol of Canadian national identity. This representation of Canada is problematic, since it erases the removal of Indigenous populations in order to create ‘empty’ landscapes. The Algonquin visitor center carefully reports a sanitized version of history that is aligned with White fantasies and aids to alleviate White guilt. Further, there is a contradiction whereby Indigenous people are transformed into commodities suggesting to visitors Indigenous people are important to Canada, while they are simultaneously erased in images of the landscape. Taxidermic representation in the visitor centers reproduce colonial logic and are an example of violent love

and discipline over other social groups. Animal and Indigenous human specimens are masked in rescue rhetoric, yet this ignores the privileged position of Euro-Canadians to move freely through these spaces without discipline and being transformed into a taxidermic spectacle. Moreover, race and species hierarchies are normalized and myths of progress entrenched in the visitor center conceal the everyday struggles for non-human species including; not crossing an invisible boundary to be hunted, fish ending up in a non-protected lake may be eaten, and for Indigenous populations the hardships they encounter in a White nation outside the space of a nature park, as well as, any land struggles over the ‘wilderness’ space.

Key findings that have been highlighted within these chapters are the continuous examples of violent love, conflation of Indigenous people with wild animals, narrative of rescue, progress, and disappearance. As I have exemplified in my analysis, progress is a White construction. I have challenged ideas that we have achieved a post-colonial state in the context of animals, such as wolves and Indigenous people. Instead there are new types of colonialism and methods of control that reproduce colonial logic under the guise of rescue. We have created fantasies about individuals; how they are represented in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula is a socially constructed version of who belongs in specific spaces in order to manufacture nature park fantasies that is essential to the ‘wilderness’ experience.

In **Chapter Six** I discuss how the violent love we (White humans) have with animals is as challenging when the analysis is shifted to an urban area. Further, while Indigenous people at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are celebrated and represented as disappearing, I shift my investigation to how this population is represented and silenced outside the space of a nature park. Violent love is not static and operates as a continuum across space that has been highlighted in **Chapters Four and Five**, yet this phenomenon is equally complex outside nature

parks when we are confronted with the conflict of coexistence that disrupts ideas of spatial belonging and challenges the role of White national governors to control the land.

## **Chapter Six: Urban Wildlife and Indigenous Resistance and Oppression outside Fantasy Spaces**

Representations of wildlife and Indigenous people are contradictory (violent love). While many believe wilderness fantasy spaces are places of celebration that rescue and protect groups associated with the Canadian national identity, I have highlighted the many inconsistent practices and representations that operate in 'wilderness' spaces. Here, I shift my analysis to representations outside a park space in order to fully examine the complexities of the violent love relationship we express towards wildlife (more specifically predator species) and Indigenous people. Part of my research is to examine the complexities of relationships that are enforced through constructions of spatial belonging and distance. Research has reported a strong link between negative attitudes and distance, for example living close to wildlife, especially wolves (Figari and Skogen 2011, Huston, Bruskotter, and Fan 2010, Kellert, Black, Rush, and Bath 1995). However, my research fills a literature gap that examines the violent love relationship that exists across spaces, from a non-park space, and as exemplified in **Chapters Four and Five** also within 'wilderness' park spaces.

This chapter addresses my third research question: how are tourist constructions and relationships spatially organized in nature parks and urban life? This question is related to my interest in how nature parks manufacture fantasy relationships. Through my examination of representation outside fantasy spaces (nature parks), I reveal that wildlife and Indigenous people are disciplined and under constant surveillance, as a result of their bodies being defined as 'out of place' in everyday White human spaces. In examples below, I challenge myths of progress through a spatial analysis. Firstly, I highlight this through my analysis of a few specific incidents in the news media involving wildlife entering urban areas that resulted in their discipline (death).

Secondly, I critique the representation of the “Idle No More Movement” in the news media, and overall how Indigenous people are often segregated to reserves and live oppressive lives. The materials under analysis are media stories and websites.

### *Urban ‘Invaders’: Human-Wildlife Conflicts*

Recently there has been an increase in reported incidents of wildlife-human conflicts in urban areas of Ontario. The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) in *Strategy for Preventing and Managing Human-Wildlife Conflicts in Ontario* (2008) define human-wildlife conflicts as: “when the actions of humans or wildlife have an adverse impact upon the other” as a result of direct interaction with one another (1). Some of the actions they describe as conflicts include: economic impacts, such as livestock predation and crop damage, structural damage to buildings, vehicle-wildlife collisions, and disease transmission. Many of these ‘conflicts’ are economically charged and rooted in humanist beliefs. Almost all of the wildlife-human conflicts defined by the Ministry of Natural Resources blame animals rather than accounting for humans’ responsibility. This is an interesting observation since the definition above suggests wildlife-human conflicts are a consequence of competing interests, such as over land and spatial usage. Yet these conflicts are continually framed through a speciesist lens that privileges and values the interests of humans over the lives of animals. All of the conflicts described by the MNR are reported as problems for humans, perpetrated by animals. However, a critical non-speciesist analysis reveals that all of these constructed problems are originally caused by human infringement on animals’ space.

Wolves (in less urban areas) and coyotes (who thrive in urban/rural areas) are perpetually vilified for livestock predation. According to Coleman (2004), Emel (1998) and Lopez (1978) this is not a new phenomenon, and is linked to earlier periods of nation-building and European

conquest. Historically, wolves were one of the most stigmatized and persecuted animals (Coleman 2004, Emel 1998, Lopez 1978). The rationale for extermination was to secure European investment and White human dominance over individuals constructed as a threat to capitalist interests (Coleman 2004, Emel 1998). Emel (1998) suggests that during 1944, Ontario was reported to have the largest wolf population in North America with the exception to Alaskan territory and the Northwest Territories in Canada, a fact that is important for the context of this research. Contemporarily, wolves and coyotes continue to be stigmatized for eating animals that humans eat and that have been socially constructed as livestock (including pigs and cows).

Kellert's (1985) national study on public perceptions revealed that the wolf and coyote are the most hated species. Another important finding is that the people who expressed the most hatred were livestock owners (Kellert 1985). I find this interesting that wolves and coyotes are blamed for killing cows or pigs, yet the speciesist relationships involved in this 'conflict' are invisible. Firstly, we blame wolves/coyotes for killing other animals when humans are participating in the same activities. We despise wolves/coyotes who attack these specific animals because we have domesticated the latter for human benefits (to consume their bodies); therefore wolves/coyotes pose economic threats. Secondly, coyotes/wolves are hated in this context because they are taking what humans perceive as 'theirs'. Nobody is analyzing why wolves/coyotes are choosing to attack livestock. Is this because there is a shortage of prey species; including deer and moose for wolves/coyotes, as a result of hunters also desiring to kill, consume, or transform their bodies into taxidermy? Also, human populations continue to grow and the invisible boundaries of where wildlife 'belongs' has been disrupted, which as a result has placed humans and coyotes/wolves into closer contact.

Another conflict articulated by the MNR is the increasing rate of motor vehicle collisions involving wildlife in North America. According to the MNR, vehicle-wildlife collisions in southern Ontario “increased from 7, 388 in 1994 to 13, 729 in 2003; an increase of 86 percent” (5). While the MNR utilizes a sympathetic tone to report that there have been over 54 human fatalities in the past ten years as a result of vehicle-wildlife conflicts, there is no mention of how many animals have been killed by humans. This again demonstrates the speciesist relationship humans express towards wildlife, as the provincial government in Ontario tracks the death of humans, yet ignores the thousands of animals that are killed by humans by motor vehicles.

Sterba (2012) reports in his research that the road-kill project conducted by Brewster Bartlett, in New England, aimed to track the number of dead animals that Sterba suggests ‘litters’ the roads. Bartlett’s 1993 findings hypothesized that nationwide, motor vehicles claimed the lives of over “41 million squirrels, 26 million cats, 22 million rats, 19 million opossums, 15 million raccoons, 6 million dogs, and 350,000 deer annually” (Sterba 2013:248). The terminology of “litter” is interesting, as if animal bodies are insignificant and are obstacles to be removed. Many uninformed people blame animals for crossing roads and highways. However, this mentality ignores the expansion of roads and according to Sterba (2012), the landscaping of nature near roads and highways that attracts wildlife. There have been methods created to mitigate wildlife-vehicle collisions in locations that are heavily populated by wildlife, such as Banff National Park in Alberta (Sterba 2012). Yet, this is not a widely undertaken remedy to this ‘conflict’, since these structural aids are often expensive and are more than likely low on the government’s agenda, due to budget constraints and deeply rooted speciesist ideologies that devalue the lives of wildlife. The death of animals from traffic and building roads in animal habitats is naturalized and viewed as unavoidable even when solutions exist; these options are



deemed not feasible. Finally, when wildlife-friendly engineered structures are created, for example, at Banff National Park the motive may be to preserve wildlife for the tourist gaze in order to generate profit from tourism. As I mentioned in **Chapters Four and Five**, wildlife are synonymous with the wilderness and the visibility of dead animal bodies in highly populated tourist areas, such as Banff would pose a contradiction to the wilderness experience.

These examples exemplify contradictions of the MNR's definition of human-wildlife conflict. While 'conflicts' are defined to be either a complication for wildlife and humans, in practice animals are blamed and subjected to discipline and control. This is rooted in speciesist ideologies of space.

### *Urban Coyotes*

Coyote sightings in urban areas in Ontario have been increasing and gaining media attention in the past few years. Public hysteria was ignited in January 2012, when a coyote jumped a fence of an Oakville residence and bit eight year old Julia Couto. According to CBC News Toronto, the girl had "three to four bite marks on her leg" but she was not injured and did not have broken skin (January 20, 2012). The reaction of the police was to track down a coyote in the area, presumed to be the 'perpetrator' and shoot him/her. This is a common control method that is highly problematic, since firstly, there is no guarantee the same coyote that is killed was the attacker. Secondly, this is a band-aid solution that will not end the growing urban wildlife population. When we remove one individual coyote there will always be another to take that individual's place. This is demonstrated in the *Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park (2002)* pamphlet that reports wolf numbers remain relatively the same, regardless of the annual shifts in wolf deaths (hunted) outside the Park's perimeter in neighbouring communities. Further,

regardless of the colonial project to eradicate wolves from the North American landscape, wolves found ways to survive; such as the remarkable interbreeding of grey wolves with coyotes.

Reactive approaches to kill urban wildlife (predator species) are normalized courses of action in order to reduce fears of public safety in urban areas. However, some cases generate more sympathy than others. This case of the police killing the suspected coyote did not generate much negative feedback in comparison to my next examples; the Cabbagetown coyote and Burlington bear. These reactions may be influenced by the ‘radical’ transgression of space undertaken by the coyote who literally entered a family’s backyard. This disrupts our idea of safety in our home and right to protect our property from ‘intruders’ (although animals do not understand these boundaries). Further, this case is an example of how distance to predator animals contributes to negative attitudes. The public’s reaction to this case demonstrates how when distance is breeched (being bitten); attitudes of sympathy or support for violent discipline are affected. However, a retributive approach leads to an animal’s death in comparison to humans who are injured, sometimes (as in this case) in minor ways, which demonstrates ingrained speciesist attitudes. The intrinsic value of animals, especially wolves/coyotes can only be recognized in specific spaces where we define them as belonging, such as wilderness parks.

Contradictions in our attitudes can be seen when we consider interactions with other closely-related species. According to the Animal Law in Canada website, there are approximately 500,000 dog bites per year in Canada and in the U.S over 4.5 million with a total dog population of 80 million in North America (Animal Law in Canada-Dog Owner’s Liability Act: May 2013). While I am not disputing that it would be a terrible experience to endure a bite from a domestic dog or a wild coyote, I am critiquing the representation of these events and difference in disciplinary actions. As I discussed above, coyotes and dogs are from a similar

ancestry but often generate different reactions. This is linked to the social construction of each species: dogs are domesticated and share intimate spaces with humans, while coyotes/wolves are wild roaming animals that we believe should only reside in nature spaces. While coyotes/wolves are a feared species, the number of dog bites reported above demonstrates a contradiction that exists between similar species. There are no hard numbers on how many coyotes live in southern Ontario since they are difficult to spot and are not tracked. When a coyote bites a human, public warnings are issued and in most cases this justifies the death of the suspected attacker. On the contrary, when a dog bites, the owners can be reprimanded and restricted from dog 'ownership'. The dog may be placed under restraint devices, such as a muzzle and in some cases the court may advise for destruction of the dog (Animal Law in Canada: May 2013).

Also, the outcome of the dog's future is influenced by size and breed discrimination. An example would be the fate of pit bulls who have been stigmatized to be a violent and dangerous species. This again demonstrates how humans continuously blame animals rather than consider what types of people choose to buy this dog breed. Pit bulls have been socially constructed as guard dogs and are often used in dog fighting. Therefore, pit bulls have come to only embody negative attitudes that may attract a more violent person because of their social construction as dangerous. This is not to suggest that all pit bulls and their owners are violent, the same would apply to golden retrievers. Golden retrievers may be a breed that generates more positive attitudes because of the types of people who own them, as a result of their social construction as family pets. Yet, this does not suggest that if a violent person mistreated a golden retriever that dog would not turn violent. Furthermore, it is important to mention that many humans are also capable of being violent under oppressive circumstances.

To put it simply, many of us more than likely know someone who has been bitten by a dog, while few know individuals who have been attacked by coyotes (of course there is a higher dog population). Human reactions to coyotes are different as a result of their social construction as a wild species, and they are viewed as a trespasser onto what humans define as their space. The different reactions and responses to urban coyotes reveal the complex violent love relationship we have with them and also demonstrates that wolves/coyotes have not obtained real 'progress' (social/moral attitude improvements).

In February 11, 2013 the top news story in local media was that of a coyote in the upscale residential area of Cabbagetown in Toronto. I investigated online media stations online including; the Star, CP 24, CTV News, and City News Toronto. I analyzed text, live videos of the coyote and police intervention, watched interviews with Cabbagetown residents and reviewed statements people posted on these same websites about the coyote killing. The findings reveal the contention between wildlife organizations, such as the Toronto Wildlife Center (TWC) and the police over how to resolve 'conflicts' with coyotes. Firstly, it is important to mention that this coyote did not attack anyone and did not pose any threats to public safety other than the perceived threat of the coyote's presence in a human community. According to the TWC, hundreds of coyotes live in the Toronto region. Further, they argue coyotes are not dangerous; rather they are shy, curious, and non-confrontational and almost never attack humans. In the news videos, the coyote never acted aggressively, yet this was used as the justification by the police to shoot and kill the coyote. This coyote appeared to be comfortable and almost posing for the camera for spectators and was behaving similarly to a domestic dog, until the police arrived on the scene, chased and shot the coyote. The coyote appeared frightened and attempted to run away from the police attackers until he/she was gunned down.

An interesting observation is that the Toronto Star featured a photograph of the coyote with his/her jaw fully opened (Figure 112). This image taps into fears that coyotes are carnivores, which is discomforting to many humans (the idea of humans being eaten by animals). Yet, in the City News Toronto video the same photo showed that actually the coyote was just yawning, as domestic dogs do (February 11, 2013). Language utilized by the media included; descriptions of the coyote as large, a predator and as stalking or lurking. These descriptions discriminate against the species by constantly referring to them as a predator thus stigmatizing coyotes. Discourses of the ‘stalking wolf’ are historical constructions according to Coleman (2004) that are linked to fears of the animal ‘other’ preying on humans. This construction is continuously played out contemporarily as discussed above and is also a discourse in the popular film *The Grey*.

Police portrayed their decision and actions as necessary in order to maintain order and ensure public safety. However, as I mentioned above, the coyote never demonstrated any threat. Residents of Cabbagetown in the City News Toronto video argue the shooting was not necessary, since they did not feel threatened (February 11, 2013). When the residents were asked by the news reporter what the appropriate action should have been, one man responded: “can’t we just box it up and send it someplace”. This individual was suggesting he did not want the blood of the coyote on his hands. However, he also did not want this coyote in his neighbourhood, suggesting humane removal as the solution to the ‘problem’. Requesting removal reproduces the idea that humans are the dominant group that are able to make decisions about the fate of animals’ lives, which denies them as active agents.

Removal practices are naturalized as ‘humane’, yet this ignores the possibility that the coyotes may be removed from their mates or offspring. Further, removing individual coyotes is a

band-aid solution to the growing urban wildlife population. Individualizing urban coyotes as problems that can be solved through removal reflects some themes of neoliberal discourse, such as the emphasis on individuals rather than analysis of structural issues. This dominant representation of coyotes does not analyze deeper social reasons, as to why coyotes are becoming more visible in urban spaces, as a consequence of urban sprawl. Human development (I call this human development since it often leads to destruction of animal habitats) includes building in areas previously defined as rural. This highlights the consequences of how human definitions of belonging and social constructions of nature and culture are problematic, since these dualisms do not welcome coexistence. Why is peaceful coexistence with predator animals such a challenge? There are many other animals who share urban cities with humans, yet they are not deemed problematic or threatening to humans, since they are often prey animals. In my neighbourhood (Burlington), many wild animals roam freely uninterrupted. In fact, many of my neighbours will go to extra measures in order to ‘help’ animals they describe as cute and harmless; such as rabbits. At the time of writing, some neighbours would not cut their grass for weeks because there is a rabbit nest in their garden and they informed me they did not want to disturb them. On the other hand, when coyotes enter urban areas, they are deemed out of place and are subjected to police control and discipline.

Overall, the Cabbagetown coyote was articulated as a victim, despite the reinscription of speciesist understandings of coyotes in the medias’ framing. Comments on *The Toronto Star* website suggest the public expressed sympathy for this specific coyote in comparison to the Oakville coyote (February 12, 2013). Some comments include: “people need to be educated and not to just kill out of ignorance” (individual one), “you don’t shoot the poor thing, let nature take its course” (individual two), and “this is heart-breaking and terribly sad. What is wrong with you

people. Take time out of your ‘busy’ schedule and do research on animal’s behaviour and temperament. Ignorant people” (individual three). These responses are much different than reactions to the Oakville coyote, which is influenced by distance to humans.

Similarly to the Cabbagetown coyote, the Burlington bear that was killed in May 2012 also ignited debate over police officers’ decision to shoot and kill the bear in a residential area. Again, police decisions to discipline the bear were justified in order to uphold public safety. According to the *Hamilton Spectator*, Halton regional police argued “they had no other alternatives” (May 17, 2012). Some of the comments online the spec.com are: “shot because of proximity to urban area” (individual one), “police tell me they had no other choice because proximity to people, safety issue” (individual two), “I think the killing of this bear is unacceptable...we are creeping onto their land” (individual three), “how can killing an innocent bear be the only option, what are we savages in Halton region. It’s called tranquilizer” (individual four). These residents’ responses are similar to the comments and reactions made about the Cabbagetown coyote, whereby removal is suggested as the best possible option due to perceived public safety issues. The above comments reveal some contradictory attitudes towards predator species. Many residents reported ‘humane’ removal as the best solution. These same animals are appreciated and respected in wilderness spaces (constructed as belonging), yet in our backyards are viewed as trespassers. Rhetoric of ‘humane’ removal aids in eliminating residents’ guilt over the death of an animal, yet this discourse plays an important role to keep the culture-nature divide in order. These comments ignore more structural issues of urban sprawl and human development in animal territory areas.

Most comments do not express the possibility of coexisting with predator animals; such as coyotes and bears. On the other hand, many people welcome deer, rabbits, squirrels, and birds.

These animals on the sociozoologic scale are constructed as ‘good’ animals, since we are not afraid of them. In fact many people intentionally feed wild animals. Sterba (2012) argues some individuals feed animals we define as non-threatening, and we invite them on our property in order to reconnect with nature. He argues humans have been alienated from the natural world that includes contact with wild animals. For people living in urban areas this may be the only contact they will ever experience with wildlife. According to the Association for the Protection of Fur-Bearing Animals, “bird feeding is the most widespread and popular form of human-wildlife interaction worldwide” (*The Wild & Free Press*: Jul 2012: 9) One of the negative outcomes of feeding wildlife in urban areas is the consequence of attracting animals that humans do not want to enter their backyard, usually these animals include coyotes/wolves, bears and other animals constructed as a pest. As reported in **Chapter Four**, habituated animals are often disciplined as a result of humans intentionally feeding wildlife. By leaving food out for what humans have defined as desirable wildlife, such as deer for example, this may also invite animals that we define as not belonging in urban human spaces.

All of the information I have reviewed on urban wildlife reported the same overlapping narrative to the public on how to deal with urban wildlife. Animal protection agencies, wildlife services, and the MNR all suggest a key solution to decrease urban ‘invaders’ (invaders refers to wild animals most humans do not want in their communities, specifically coyotes/wolves and bears) is to eliminate all feeding wildlife. During this research project, I attended a wildlife conference in Toronto that included presentations by academics, the MNR, animal protection agencies, and the Toronto Wildlife Center; I was disturbed by the overall takeaway message. The solution to urban wildlife was again, as reported in Algonquin the “do not feed” narrative. While I am not disagreeing that people should refrain from feeding and attracting wildlife into



urban areas for the safety of animals and residents, I am suggesting when this becomes the most dominant narrative that power relations between humans and animals are being reinforced. Individualizing this growing social problem is highly problematic and reinforces a neoliberal ideology that deflects attention from human speciesist attitudes and structural issues involving the expansion of capitalism.

While the public responses to the Cabbagetown coyote and Burlington bear are sympathetic, they reproduce speciesist ideologies about animals belonging in specific spaces. This is highlighted by the revelation of dominant views suggesting the coyote and bear should be removed. Also, I juxtaposed these cases with another disciplined coyote (Oakville coyote) that was framed much differently in the media. This animal was not constructed as a victim, since not only did this animal violate the spatial dualism of nature and culture, the Oakville coyote bit a child, an act that is articulated as a radical breach of distance undertaken by wild animals against humans in spaces of exclusion.

Education on predator species is imperative in order to eliminate reactive wildlife control regimes and achieve wildlife advocates goal of coexistence. The TWC, Fur Bearer Defenders, the MNR and the general public (comments on websites) advocate for coyotes and bears, suggesting education is significant to dismantle myths and promote peaceful coexistence. Education is a significant variable in reactions towards wolves. Kellert's (1985) national study revealed a strong correlation between higher education and positive attitudes towards wolves. Individuals with some graduate education express the most positive attitudes (60), then some college (51), high school (37), and lower than 6<sup>th</sup> grade education (24). Negative attitudes follow the same pattern in Kellert's study: lower than 6<sup>th</sup> grade education have the highest negative

attitudes towards wolves (60), high school (42), some college (29), and some graduate education (21).

Wilson and Heberlein (1996) explore the recreational context of the wolf in the U.S and similarly to Kellert (1985), demonstrate a strong correlation between higher education and expression of positive attitudes towards wolves. Cambronne et al (1992) report that while only 13% of the U.S population have a college degree, 34% of all people who travel to and visit the International Wolf Center (IWC) in Ely, Minnesota are college educated (Wilson and Heberlein 1996). More striking evidence Cambronne (1992) reports is that only approximately 7% of the U.S. population hold a graduate degree, yet 31% of IWC visitors are graduate educated. Kellert (1985) more specifically reports a strong link between higher knowledge of animals with more positive attitudes. His findings include: high knowledge of animals (21.7), moderate knowledge (5.4), and low knowledge (3.0). Overall, the group that has been identified as expressing the most positive attitudes towards wolves according to Kellert, Black, Rush and Bath (1995) are: more educated, city and suburban dwellers, younger people, and from a higher socio-economic bracket. This population is more inclined to view “the wolf as possessing considerable ecological, recreational, and existence value”, therefore this group of people is most likely to study and advocate for the protection and restoration of wolves (Kellert, Black, Rush and Bath 1995:980).

Thus a strong link is reported between knowledge of animals, education and positive attitudes towards wolves. This is important as the media cases discussed above on urban wildlife indicate that a long-term solution to protect predator species is to educate the public. These groups envision the dismantling of negative stereotypes of coyotes and wolves in the media. Challenging the dominant representations of coyotes/wolves in the media is an important step in

order to change attitudes, since the media play a significant role in shaping attitudes. However, the approach to education I have articulated above is not the agenda of the MNR. This is problematic since government outreach and resources are vital in order to spread widespread knowledge on coyotes. The MNR idea of education includes: educating the public about ecological principles, providing information about human-wildlife conflicts in educational institutions, raising awareness on the public's influence on conflicts, and emphasizing the role of resource management activities (hunting, conservation, and wildlife rehabilitation) (*Strategy for Preventing and Managing Human-Wildlife Conflicts in Ontario* 2008). While these recommendations from a government perspective may be advocated as solutions to urban wildlife, as I mentioned above the MNR defines human-wildlife conflicts through a speciesist lens. The MNR even encourages hunting as a tool to regulate and control the lives of animals that are perceived as overpopulated (for example deer), yet this framing of hunting as a 'solution' to urban wildlife issues ignores the fact that the government generates profit from the hunting industry. Furthermore, the MNR description of education reinforces a neoliberal mentality. The definition of education individualizes the conflicts we have with wildlife and does not imagine coexistence with predator species as an option. The widespread adoption of neoliberalism is a means to deflect attention away from larger social issues. This is similar to the collapse of the social safety net that has resulted in the individualization of poverty and criminality in North America that shifts attention from macro social injustices, such as corporate crime (Balfour and Comack 2006). As a result of individualist ideologies, coexistence is not viewed as an option for most people and agencies that contribute to the reproduction of human supremacy.

Additionally, while there has been an increase in cases of wildlife (predator) sightings in the past few years there have simultaneously been government budget cuts. The Fur-Bearer

Defenders report that in spring 2012, the Ontario MNR made cuts to the Bear Wise Program that resulted in a reduction of bear technicians from 48 to 21 (*The Wild & Free Press*: Jul 2012). The organization argues this is problematic, since this leaves communities unequipped to deal with ‘nuisance’ bears. As a result, in communities that do not have bear technicians, police are often expected to eradicate the problem. This often leads to shooting the animal as a consequence of a lack of education, knowledge of wildlife, and adequate training on wildlife-human interactions. The Bear Wise Program is a positive government program that will aid in reducing the number of bears entering human communities. On the other hand, this program reinforces ideas of spatial belonging that is embedded within speciesism. Nevertheless the Bear Wise program will aid in reducing the violent discipline undertaken towards bears. I advocate for more programs that educate individuals about wildlife, especially a program about coyotes/wolves that are living and flourishing in urban areas.

According to Sterba (2012) we have become ‘*denatured*’. Sterba (2012) explains this as a phenomenon whereby we have become divorced from our natural environment and wildlife in comparison to previous generations, despite the reality that humans in the eastern United States live in closer proximity to wild animals than anywhere in the world at any time in history. Sterba acknowledges the radicalness of his claims, yet supports his argument suggesting humans now share smaller areas of space with animals than ever before. He also argues that we have become denatured through humans segregation to the world of indoors that has left humans withdrawn from nature and resulted in minimal direct contact with wildlife. Sterba (2012) argues our experiences with nature are often delivered to us through media consumption, whereby we watch television shows on nature rather than directly experience nature. This process of what Sterba refers to as denaturing, has resulted in our lack of understanding and education on predator

species. Education is vital to repairing positive attitudes towards wolves that have endured a history of segregation and victimization for their carnivore lifestyle (species discrimination). We need to relearn nature if animal protection groups want to eliminate the discipline of predator species that enter urban areas. Shifts in social values and learning to appreciate the intrinsic value of all animals through the abandonment of speciesist constructions of certain species will aid in securing a future of coexistence during a time-period of rapid expansion in the GTA.

Thus far, I have exposed and discussed some of the contradictory attitudes we express towards predator species when they enter urban areas and spaces we define as human. While the Cabbagetown coyote and Burlington bear were framed as victims in the media, negative stereotypes about them were simultaneously recreated. Attitudes are never static, since distance to coyotes has been identified as an influencing factor on positive or negative attitudes. Additionally, not all urban spaces respond the same to wildlife entering the community. Windsor, Ontario promotes coyote hunting as a tourist attraction. The CBC News Windsor website suggests that hunting coyotes will reduce the perceived overpopulation of the species (February 19, 2013). However, the news story does report that hunting in localized areas will not alter the population significantly, since coyotes are a top predator and the population will naturally sustain itself according to food supply (prey animals) in the area. On the website, people could vote if they felt coyote hunting should be celebrated as a tourist attraction. The results indicated that approximately 40% (879 votes) responded yes, while 60% (1,321 votes) selected no. While these findings are difficult to generalize to the city of Windsor, since I was able to vote and do not reside in Windsor, the results were still shocking revealing that a high number of voters supported urban city coyote hunting in Windsor. Further, comments posted online were much more negative than the reactions and postings for the Cabbagetown coyote and

Burlington bear. Many comments asserted people's right to protect their property, including livestock that is socially constructed as property. One individual reported "I'd be a hypocrite if I had anything against it. The pelts are nice. The Canada Goose coat I bought my wife a couple of years ago is rimmed with coyote fur. Farmers also have a right to protect their livestock" (CBC News Windsor). This comment is a demonstration of conscious violent love. Moreover, this individual reported that he loves coyote fur because it looks nice, yet he also indirectly participates in and supports the violence that leads to coyotes' death through the fetishization of fur as a commodity. The point is that attitudes are not static across space from 'wilderness' parks and urban areas. They are influenced by distance and shift across different geographic areas. Further, positive attitudes towards wolves have been strongly linked to education and socio-economic status (Kellert 1985, Wilson and Heberlein 1996). I began wondering how a community, such as Windsor could generate almost 40% public support for hunting coyotes as a tourist industry. This would be unacceptable in Burlington or Toronto, as exemplified by the responses in the media cases I highlighted above. The more negative attitudes expressed by Windsor residents may be linked to the fact that there is a larger population of working class inhabitants in Windsor. Kellert (1985) reports that education is a strong correlating factor that results in more positive attitudes towards predator species. Therefore, a working class population are much more likely to have less education and as a result express more negative attitudes. A more important factor is the spatial location of Windsor. The city of Windsor is located in close proximity to rural locations. As mentioned in the literature review, Figari and Skogen (2011), Kellert (1985), Kellert et al (1995) report that rural residents express more negative attitudes in comparison to urban residents. Also, since Windsor is located closer to rural regions, the people of Windsor may be more exposed to negative media stories and information involving coyotes.

This is significant since Karlsson and Sjostrom (2007) report that people who live 150-200 km's away from a wolf territory are more predisposed to negative attitudes towards wolves.

Another common representation of coyotes/wolves in the media is the vilification of coyotes for eating domestic animals; such as, dogs and cats. This is a continuous discourse that arises in public discussions about living with wildlife, including coyotes. Online material stressed the importance of keeping pets indoors during episodes of 'loose' coyotes, such as the Cabbagetown coyote. The idea of coyotes eating our family pets creates public anxiety and discomfort. Attitudes towards urban coyotes are also linked to subjective experiences. On the National Post website report of the Oakville coyote, an individual commented: "a good coyote is a dead coyote, a few years ago about a dozen of the vermin attacked my old dog in my fenced back yard. Fortunately I got there in time, or they would have killed her. Within two days there were a lot more good coyotes" (January 20, 2012). Firstly, the rhetoric of vermin and a 'good coyote is a dead coyote' are rooted in colonial world views (Coleman 2004, Emel 1998, Lopez 1978). These same mentalities were the rationale for the widespread extermination of wolves in North America (Coleman 2004, Emel 1998, Lopez 1978). Secondly, I read this individual's comment as a reclaiming of their human identity and domination over a species he/she views as a threat to his/her domestic companion animal. Their final comment "within two days there were a lot more good coyotes" and his/her first comment "a good coyote is a dead coyote" suggests to me that he/she personally killed a group of coyotes that were assumed to be the perpetrators of what this person perceived as an injustice.

While I am not disputing that the experience of having one's dog or cat eaten by coyotes' would not be traumatic and upsetting, I am suggesting this reproduces a species hierarchy that in this case is linked to colonial associations with wolves/coyotes. This creates a hierarchy of worth

that shapes attitudes and thereafter results in protection, or control and exploitation. This is exemplified when contradictory attitudes towards coyotes and domestic animals are evaluated. Public fear over coyotes eating dogs and cats is speciesist. Firstly, according to the Ontario government, it is imperative to spay or neuter dogs in order to decrease chances of domestic dogs mating with coyotes (*Living with Wildlife: Protecting Dogs from Coyotes*). I highlight this since this demonstrates the violent love relationship we express towards animals who are so similar they can successfully reproduce together. The difference is that coyotes/wolves are constructed as a wild species, while dogs are domesticated animals who have been transformed into human companions. Secondly, while coyotes are constructed as animal killers it is important to report that dogs and cats kill numerous wild animals. Sterba (2012) reports free roaming feral cats are responsible for a significant amount of wildlife mortality, including “hundreds of millions of birds, small mammals, reptiles, amphibians, and fish” (259). Furthermore, coyotes are constructed as ruthless killers, yet cats also viciously attack wild animals. Cats maim, maul, dismember, rip apart and gut animals while still alive (Sterba 2012). Coyotes only kill for food, while cats sometimes kill for food and other times to practice hunting skills. Pet and feral cats are responsible for the killing of over 500 million birds in the United States and estimates for North America increase to approximately a billion annually according to the American Bird Conservancy (Sterba 2012).

I have highlighted the different reactions to coyotes and cats that both kill prey animals in order to demonstrate the hierarchy that humans have created for animals, whereby cats and dogs are the most protected species in North America. Kellert’s (1985) national study also confirms that domestic animals generate more positive attitudes than many other species. Dogs ranked number one and cats were rated ninth out of twenty-six species in the study (Kellert 1985).



Coyotes and wolves were the least liked. This is an interesting observation since dogs ranked number one, yet species that dogs share similar ancestry with (coyotes/wolves) were the least liked. While cats are carnivores and killers of wild animals they are constructed as companion animals that warrants their protection. When coyotes eat our 'friends', humans vilify the carnivore animal, yet ignore the fact that their pet (e.g. an outdoor cat) may be inflicting similar damage on other species. Many people advocate for cats, whereas coyotes and wolves have fewer admirers. Our attitudes towards animals are a result of social constructions. Therefore, dismantling myths and providing knowledge on predator species is imperative in order to reduce acts of lethal discipline.

This section on urban wildlife has revealed the violent love relationship we express towards wolves/coyotes in an urban context. Attitudes are highly complicated and are influenced by numerous factors exemplified in the abovementioned media cases; distance, urban location, subjective experiences, and negative encounters with wolves. Other variables that Kellert (1985) reports include: education, knowledge of animals, socio-economic status, age and urban or rural resident status. This discussion on urban representation of wildlife, more specifically wolves/coyotes has aimed to provide a wider context of the violent love relationship we express towards wildlife. An important finding is that while we express violent love relationships with many animals, our relationship with wolves/coyotes is most contradictory. A spatial analysis reveals the conflicting representations from a wilderness space to an urban landscape. Wolves/coyotes representation is important to investigate for this research since: firstly, they are constructed in commodities as embodying wilderness (wild, resistant and untamed) that clashes with ideas of belonging in urban spaces; secondly, wolves are colonial bodies that is important for my goal in this research to challenge fantasies of progress.

I review the key findings of this section in the chapter summary. For now, I shift my analysis to exploring how Indigenous people are represented outside nature parks in order to reveal the violent love relationships we express towards populations we view as a threat and that are symbols of resistance to the White national governors. Moreover, wildlife (wolves/coyotes) and Indigenous people are disciplined across space in order for race and human supremacy to remain intact.

*Invisibility of the Visible Issues Indigenous Populations Experience in Non-Park Spaces*

In Canada (although not exclusively there), Indigenous populations have historically and contemporarily experienced high levels of abuse, racial/cultural discrimination, exploitation, and government negligence to address social injustices that disrupt and destroy lives. Kimmel and Holler (2011) report “Canada is ranked third in the world on the Human Development Index” (HDI), but if the ranking was exclusively applied to Indigenous people in Canada the HDI would decrease to 68 in ranking (150). Internationally Canada is praised as a diverse country that offers opportunities for a high quality of life. This national reputation is a fantasy that conceals the oppressive practices, policies and punitive punishment Indigenous populations suffer in all spatial regions within Canada (Bracekn, Deane and Morrisette 2009).

There are over 500 missing Indigenous women in Canada and police do not often take these cases seriously, since they do not fit the White standards of victimhood (Culhane 2009). Indigenous people are the most disproportionately incarcerated group in Canada (Annual Report of the Office of the Correctional Investigator 2012-2013, Balfour and Comack 2006). While they only comprise three percent of the population, in 2001 Indigenous people represented 21 percent of the provincial prison population and 18 percent of federal institutions (Comack 2006). Suicide in penal institutions is most likely to be undertaken by Indigenous people, more specifically

women (Comack 2006, McGill 2008). Indigenous women experience high levels of sexual and physical assault by both Indigenous and White men (Balfour and Comack 2006). Further, Indigenous communities have a history of colonialism and assimilative government policies, such as residential schools that create intergenerational layers of violence (Balfour and Comack 2006). Indigenous populations are the most impoverished group in Canada that are segregated and confined to remote areas that conceals the hardships these communities experience. While research identifies these social injustices Indigenous people experience in Canada; much of the discrimination, oppression and practices of social exclusion remain unattended to by the government. An important finding in my research is the theme of how we ‘love’ (as well as recolonize) Indigenous people in ‘wilderness’ spaces, while simultaneously ignoring the endless injustices they experience in non-park spaces.

As I have explored in the previous chapter, our relationships with Indigenous people are counterfeit. Indigenous people are constituted as important to Canadian national identity and they are celebrated within wilderness spaces. Yet, in this research I examined how wilderness parks are a new type of colonialism. They are colonial spaces that continually discipline animal and Indigenous bodies through commodification and taxidermic transformation. The disappearance theme I exemplified in **Chapter Five** is significant, as this narrative erases Indigenous people’s agency. Further, this is a contradiction since in wilderness parks Indigenous people are portrayed as dead or disappearing, while simultaneously Indigenous populations resist oppressive White assimilative policies and land conflicts outside (and in some cases inside) fantasy nature spaces.

The Idle No More Movement is a grassroots national movement in Canada that emerged in late October 2012, in response to Harper’s conservative government changes to legislation Bill

C-45 that violates treaty rights (CBC News Canada: January 5, 2013). According to CBC News Canada, the mission of the Idle No More movement is to call “on all people to join in a revolution which honors and fulfils Indigenous sovereignty which protects land and water” (January 5, 2013). The three specific acts that are critiqued by Indigenous populations to be violated are: the Indian Act, Navigation Protection Act and the Environmental Assessment Act. The latter two are important for the context of this research. The violations of these acts are examples of the government’s negligent role in preserving the environment and failure to consider the consequences of environmental disasters from a pipeline spill. Further, the Idle No More Movement highlights the agency of Indigenous people to resist the exploitation of land and water. Important critiques from the amendments to the Navigation Protection Act are that less support is needed for pipeline projects; now no proof is required that a corporation’s activities will not cause damage that was previously legally required. Amendments to the Environmental Assessment Act have resulted in faster approval processes for potentially dangerous and exploitative industries.

Many of the movement’s tactics included public demonstrations in public areas of large cities and Parliament Hill in Ottawa, as well as blocking roads, bridges and railways throughout Canada. A significant number of media stories highlighted the hunger strike of Chief Theresa Spence, with intentions to obtain a meeting with Prime Minister Steven Harper to discuss social issues facing Indigenous populations in Canada. This media framing is problematic as it shifts attention from the seriousness of the injustices that created the movement. The Idle No More Movement has also been critiqued as being similar to the Occupy Movement. This association has negative implications since corporate media consistently suggested that the Occupy Movement would collapse as a result of poor organization. Such claims about lack of

organization of the movement misrepresent the reasoning the movement used to refrain from adopting a hierarchal model. This method of leadership was selected in order to demonstrate their commitment to anti-oppressive principles. The *National Post* was typical in its condemnation of the Idle No More Movement as not having any tangible solutions and lacking a concrete agenda (January 4, 2013). The media's decision to sensationalize the hunger strike and road block protests undermines the original reasons as to why the movement was established (violation of treaty rights). These types of representation are a diversion that fails to address systemic issues and take responsibility for the harms we (mainstream non-Indigenous society) inflict on Indigenous communities.

During the past winter while researching and following the Idle No More Movement I was a teaching assistant for a university sociology course: gender and crime. When we were discussing Indigenous issues and resistance, I asked the seminar if they were aware of the Idle No More Movement. Many of the students did not know about the movement and the people who had some knowledge, were uninformed. This observation was shocking since many of the students were studying sociology and were unaware of an important movement that was highly visible in the media. On the *National Post* website, a poll randomly surveyed 1, 626 Canadian adults and the findings report that "61 percent of Canadians said police should not allow Idle No More protesters to block major highways, rail lines, and border crossings," while one quarter reported support for the blockades and no police intervention and 14 percent were undecided (January 4, 2013). Further, other questions and results of the poll reveal that 78 percent of respondents are aware of the Idle No More Movement, while 22 percent were not. Thirty-nine percent of the sample believes that Indigenous people are treated unjustly by the federal government, while forty-nine percent disagreed. Forty-four percent of the surveyed population

reported that Indigenous people are poorly-served by the reserve system, while twenty-two believe well-served. Overall, only 36 percent of Ontario surveyed residents support the Idle No More Movement.

Despite the fact that 78 percent of respondents are aware of the movement and 44 percent of the sample agreed that Indigenous people are poorly-served by the reserve system, only 36 percent of Ontario residents support the movement. Here is some evidence of the contradictions of how Indigenous people are imagined by the public in different spaces. Equally disturbing was the finding that 22 percent of respondents believe Indigenous people are well-served on reserves and 34 percent of the sample is ambivalent. This may be influenced by the invisibility of Indigenous reserve communities to mainstream society. Personally, I have never been on a reserve as a result of these places being spatially segregated. Prior to my university education I had a limited understanding of Indigenous social injustices. My conception of reserves was that they were spaces of poverty and criminality; however, I was unaware of the magnitude to which the reserve system has failed Indigenous people in this country. The containment of Indigenous people in reserves allows their oppression to be invisible to a large portion of non-Indigenous society that is not exposed to reserve life, which may attempt to explain why so many people were undecided or why 22 percent of respondents in the *National Post* suggested that reserves served Indigenous groups well.

My last comments on the Idle No More Movement are on the medias' support for Steven Harper that leads into my next argument on the pipeline project. According to the *National Post*, Harper is the first Prime Minister to publicly apologize for Residential Schools and he endorsed the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (January 4, 2013). Further, he included Indigenous people living on reserves to the Canadian Human Rights Act, and

additionally he appointed an Innu Cabinet minister. While on the surface these examples could be viewed as progress for Indigenous people, these inclusions should have been implemented long ago. Harper supporters advocate that Harper should be applauded for including Indigenous people to legislation and finally publicly apologizing for the Residential School system, this is a rational choice that was long overdue, rather than something requiring a celebration of Harper's achievements. Also, implementing legislation does not guarantee the elimination of Indigenous oppression. For example, McGill (2008) critiques Canada for violating our international agreement of the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). She highlights the injustices of what she refers to as "Canada's colonial prison system" that fails to uphold rights and humane treatment to Indigenous women (90). McGill (2008) highlights this in her example of the suicide of Ashley Smith, an Indigenous youth who was confined in segregation and ended her own life in front of several guards at the Grand Valley Federal institution in Kitchener, Ontario. It is problematic that we try to celebrate these legal implementations as progress.

While the conservative federal government is framed in the media example above as taking a proactive step in addressing Indigenous social issues, this perspective fails to acknowledge Harper's support for the Keystone pipeline project that moves oil from Alberta to oil refineries on the U.S. Gulf Coast. In the *Globe and Mail* online, Harper advocates for the pipeline project, suggesting that the TransCanada Corp project could potentially create over 40,000 U.S. jobs (May 16, 2013). He suggests this project is essential to economic and social development that would contribute significantly to the United States long-term energy security. Harper argues "the only real immediate environmental issues here, he added is do we want to increase the flow of oil from Canada via pipeline or via rail" (The Globe and Mail: May 16,

2013). This perspective is not surprising since the conservative government's agenda is aligned with business and economic growth taking a higher priority over social issues; such as, environmental disasters and climate change. Further, Harper's advocacy and support for the pipeline project is an extension of his agenda to enhance Canada's international business relations.

Some people may support Harper's advocacy for the pipeline project, as this may be a short-term solution to produce employment during an economically turbulent and unstable time-period. Therefore Harper's support for the pipeline project could be an instrumental political decision in order to deliver public good to citizens, suggesting he is creating jobs and stabilizing the Canadian economy. Pal (2010) argues when politicians claim to solve one problem there are often a set of interrelated problems that emerge. While the pipeline project may create jobs, this project could potentially create illness in humans, animals and destroy landscapes and waterways. I raise concerns about the pipeline projects because many of these pipelines impact Indigenous communities. Further, anti-pipeline protests and resistance have been important to the Idle No More Movement.

Pipeline 9 is the first commercial pipeline project in North America that runs from Sarnia, Ontario to Montreal, Quebec. According to the *Financial Post*, Enbridge Inc has applied to increase the oil capacity from 240,000 barrels per day to 300,000 (May 25, 2013). Also, a heated debate has ignited about the demands to reverse the pipeline flow. First the flow of line 9 carried the oil from Sarnia to Montreal in order to secure a source of energy. In the 1990s oil imports became more affordable and "the line was reversed to flow westbound" (Ontario Chamber of Commerce). Currently, market conditions have again influenced reversal pipeline plans, whereby Canadian oil is much cheaper than imported oil, which has led to the decision to



once again reverse the flow; now, eastbound from Sarnia to Montreal (Ontario Chamber of Commerce). There has been a huge backlash against the pipeline 9 reversal plans, since people are concerned that the reversal may lead to a rupture or an oil leak. As a result, there has been an emergence in protests, especially in Ontario's chemical valley, Sarnia. According to Desmog Canada, Sarnia represents 40% of the chemical industry in Canada (May 20, 2013). Tar Sands Blockade website reports that over 63 petrochemical facilities surround the Anishinaabe community of Aamjiwnaang First Nation, whereby health is severely negatively affected including; a high miscarriage rate (40%), low life expectancy (55) and cancer is widespread in these communities (April 4, 2013). Not by coincidence, many Indigenous communities are crossed by pipeline projects. This is another act of colonization against Indigenous land and people. We push Indigenous people to the most remote areas of the Canadian landscape, and then we allow corporations to build dangerous and hazardous pipelines that could potentially disrupt their environment, livelihood and health.

There have been a sufficient number of recent oil spill cases within the past few years that should demonstrate evidence of the potential hazards from pipeline projects and reversals. In 2010, Enbridge Inc's (same company involved with pipeline 9 reversal) Lakehead system near Marshall, Michigan in the U.S. spilled over "20,000 barrels of crude oil" into waterways (*Financial Post*: March 25, 2013). Great Plains Tar Sands Resistance group reports that on March 29, 2013 Exxon Mobil was responsible for spilling approximately 210,000 gallons of tar sands crude oil in Mayflower, Arkansas from a pipeline flow from Canada. This disaster damaged family homes, destroyed waterways and killed/injured wildlife and aquatic species. CBC Hamilton reports there was a Enbridge Line 10 rupture in a soybean field that runs from Hamilton to Buffalo (May 6, 2013). Also, on April 29, 2011 in the Peace Region of Northern

Alberta over 30,000 barrels of oil leaked into the Little Buffalo community (First Nations group) that has affected human health including; burning eyes, headaches and nausea, as well as damages to the forest and bog (rabble.ca: May 4, 2011). While there are many more cases that could be reported on the problem of pipeline projects, I end my investigation here. I highlighted case studies of pipeline disasters, since they are connected to the violation of treaty rights in the Idle No More Movement. Further, they are examples of Indigenous resistance that challenges fantasies of disappearance.

This brief case study of Indigenous oppression and representation outside fantasy 'wilderness' spaces has been exemplified in order to provide a spatial analysis of violent love. Through my assessment of non-park Indigenous representation, I have exposed different ways that Indigenous populations are recolonized by oil companies through exploitation of land and waterways. The example of pipeline 9 highlights the injustices that Indigenous people experience in Canada. As mentioned above, Sarnia is the most polluted place in Canada and by no accident is this industrial chemical complex built around an Indigenous community. Environmentally destructive industries that cause numerous health issues are reported to most affect marginalized communities as a consequence of their social position (Schlosser 2002). Schlosser (2002) reports, slaughterhouse companies in the U.S. build their facilities in disenfranchised communities in order to exploit cheap labour, whereby several environmental and human health issues likely go unchecked as opposed to a more privileged neighbourhood or region. Containing Indigenous populations in toxic regions and near pipeline projects is a contradiction to their image as national symbols of Canada that is found at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. As reported in **Chapter Five**, they are celebrated and transformed into tourist spectacles and

commodities at the Parks, yet as discussed above outside nature parks their visible oppression is rendered invisible.

Culhane (2009) explores the phenomenon of Indigenous issues being turned into mass media spectacles, while at the same time, Indigenous suffering is forgotten and not taken seriously. She refers to this process as the *regime of disappearance*. Culhane (2009) borrows “this term from Goode and Maskovsky, who have coined it to describe a neo-liberal mode of governance that selectively marginalizes or erases categorizes of people through strategies of representation that include silences, blind spots, and displacements that have both material and symbolic effects” (78). I apply this framework of understanding to my examples above. While the movement has generated a significant amount of media attention, the *National Post* poll results revealed that regardless of the 78% of people who are aware of the movement, only 36% of Ontario residents support the movement. I highlight the significance of Ontario public attitudes since my research is focused on an Ontario context. Also, according to the Ontario Ministry of Finance, a 2006 census revealed that Ontario has the highest Indigenous population in Canada with over 242, 495 people (2006 Census Highlights: Factsheet 9). While Indigenous social injustices and concerns are visible in the media, the poll results reveal ambivalence towards Indigenous people. Indigenous communities are spaces of exploitation that are often spatially segregated from the White gaze that allows Indigenous people to remain ‘dead’ in the minds of mainstream society.

The regime of disappearance is important to highlight since disappearing is a continuous theme that affects Indigenous communities. In **Chapters Four and Five** I revealed the dominant disappearing narrative of Indigenous people in ‘wilderness’ landscapes. When Indigenous people are visible and resist in large numbers; such as the Idle No More Movement and participation in

protests against pipeline projects the injustices that motivate them are silenced. This technique of silencing allows Whites to maintain their privilege and power, as well as preserve the colonial project to eliminate any threats to the White nation. The hiding of exploitation in plain sight is a fantasy for Whites to imagine their legacy and contemporary colonial practices as innocent.

The example of the pipeline spills and Harper's support for the Keystone pipeline project exemplifies the spatial violent love we express towards the environment. While there are some environmentally degrading activities at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula, overall these spaces are preserved in order to manufacture wilderness fantasies. The cases above highlight that outside these sanitized spaces, environmental protection is trumped by economic development. Building of pipelines poses many risks to the environment and exemplifies humans' callous disregard for non-human life and non-human animals who are affected by oil spills, a disregard rooted in speciesist attitudes. In this section my goal was to provide a spatial lens to the counterfeit relationships we construct with Indigenous people in Canada through my analysis of the Idle No More Movement and investigation into pipeline project cases. The next and final chapter analyzes further connections on spatial organization of relationships and continues to disrupt fantasies of progress and White human innocence.

## **Chapter Summary**

This chapter has provided a preliminary investigation of the extent that tourist constructions and relationships are spatially organized from nature parks to places outside fantasy wilderness spaces. The chapter is organized into two themes: the first examines human-wildlife conflicts and urban coyotes, second the invisibility of visible issues Indigenous populations experience in non-park spaces. My intention in this chapter was to reveal the way animal (more specifically wolves/coyotes) and Indigenous bodies are regulated, disciplined,

controlled, and coded as not belonging in spaces outside of what White humans have defined as ‘wilderness’. I reported numerous factors that contribute to negative representations of colonial bodies.

Firstly, I examined the rhetoric of human-wildlife conflicts. The framing of the conflicts by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) reveals the entrenched speciesist attitudes humans express towards non-human animals. Two major conflicts identified by the MNR are: the risks that wildlife-vehicle collisions pose to humans and concerns over livestock predation being undertaken by wolves and coyotes. The dominant narrative revealed through analyzing literature produced by the MNR was the lack of accountability for human responsibility in human-wildlife conflicts that reproduces speciesist logic. Animals are continuously blamed and disciplined for conflicts that result in human injury (vehicle collisions) and economic loss. Many people deflect the human consequences that often result in an animal’s death by reducing animals to inferior beings. Many effective solutions to eliminate automobile collisions with humans and wildlife are deemed unfeasible. We continuously describe wildlife-human conflicts in speciesist terms that fail to acknowledge the reasons as to why more wildlife are entering urban areas; such as, urban sprawl and the expansion of human development. This chapter has highlighted that we find it challenging to coexist in urban spaces with animals we categorize as wild and dangerous.

Secondly, I analyzed different media cases on urban wildlife. Analyzing different news stories provided insight on the complex factors that contribute to loving or hating an individual animal. Distance was identified as significant to determining attitudes towards a specific animal. The Oakville coyote was framed as a perpetrator that violated an invisible boundary between human and animal spaces. Not only did the coyote disrupt fantasies of the nature-culture divide, the coyote entered the private space of a human’s backyard and bit a child. This perceived

radical transgression of space warranted the death of this coyote. This is demonstrated by the majority of public's reactions that either supported or remained ambivalent about the police adopting a retributive regime. The Cabbagetown coyote was articulated in the media differently than the Oakville coyote. The Cabbagetown coyote was framed as non-threatening and viewed sympathetically. Regardless of the sympathy over the killing of the coyote that was exemplified by people's responses online and in news interviews, many residents did not suggest that coexistence was possible. Public opinion suggests coyotes should be 'humanely' removed and relocated to somewhere else. This finding is significant, since it demonstrates the spatial designations humans have created that constitutes who belongs and who should be excluded. The Burlington bear also generated a sympathetic tone, yet unsafe distance was also constructed as the problem that resulted in the disciplining of the bear.

Many wildlife organizations and public comments online suggest that education on wildlife is a key strategy in order to decrease misunderstandings of predator animals that in many cases lead to police shootings. The educational agenda of the MNR is speciesist that ignores the intrinsic worth of animals. One solution advocated by government officials is to control perceived overpopulated animal species through regulating hunting and culls if 'necessary'. Dismantling negative attitudes towards wildlife (more specifically wolves/coyotes) through educational outreach is an important step in order to remove stigma to colonized animals. There has been research that has reported the link between education/knowledge on animals to positive attitudes (Kellert 1985, Wilson and Heberlein 1996). Yet, the MNR has recently made budget cuts that has resulted in a reduction in the number of staff that are educated on bears to assist communities with bear 'problems'. These decisions will likely contribute to more aggressive bear management practices that involve violent discipline. Many of the common solutions

recommended to deter wildlife invaders suggest eliminating all wildlife feeding. While this is important as feeding often leads to habituated animals and results in discipline, this narrative ignores structural issues of human progress. Further, feeding wildlife is only constructed as a ‘conflict’ when animals we perceive as wild and threatening enter what are constructed as human spaces.

Another important finding I revealed is species discrimination. While some people intentionally feed birds or squirrels, they likely would not welcome bears or wolves/coyotes. Coyotes are continuously framed as carnivores who eat animals humans describe as cute. Further, they are constructed as pet murderers (cats and dogs). This demonstrates the hierarchy of worth humans have created about non-human animals. While outdoor pet cats are also carnivores who are responsible for killing many wild animals, they are awarded protection. Yet, coyotes/wolves are constructed as killers. This is an interesting observation since many humans also participate in the daily consumption of animal bodies. Humans’ continued vilification of predator species is linked to fears of loss of human supremacy, whereby these animals can potentially kill and eat us. Another finding from my analysis was that not all urban cities produce the same attitudes towards coyotes. This investigation has revealed that attitudes are influenced by numerous factors; such as, distance, urban location, subjective experiences, and negative encounters.

Representations of Indigenous populations outside wilderness fantasy spaces were also examined. Indigenous people have been reported to be the most marginalized group in Canada that suffer a low quality of life, who continue to suffer from the consequences of colonization (Balfour and Comack 2006). They also experience new types of colonialism that I articulated above in **Chapter Five**; such as, the colonization of their culture in wilderness spaces through

commodification and taxidermic transformation. These representations are problematic that contribute to the White nation fantasy. I analyzed media representation of the Idle No More Movement and pipeline resistance. The original reasons for the movement (violation of treaty rights) were overshadowed by the hunger strike spectacle. Only 36 percent of Ontario residents supported the movement and many respondents reported ambivalence towards the government's services to the reserve system (*National Post*: January 4, 2013). Recent legislation inclusions for Indigenous people are celebrated as progress. This ignores the impracticality of legal policy instruments as a solution to improving the lives of Indigenous people. We push reserve Indigenous populations to remote areas of the Canadian landscape, whereby their oppression and presence are concealed from the White gaze. Pipeline projects violate water and land rights. Additionally, in the event of an oil disaster Indigenous communities are in closer proximity to pipeline projects. Indigenous populations are recolonized by the oil companies and government that allow potentially destructive commodities to flow through communities that have already suffered abuse and continue to experience the intergenerational consequences of colonization and assimilative government policies. Also, pipeline projects exemplify the violent love relationship humans express towards earth and non-human species who would be impacted by oil spills in the pursuit of economic progress and human development.

A significant finding is the theme of disappearance. While I discussed this narrative within **Chapters Four and Five**, the disappearance discussed here is different that analyzes how visible issues and Indigenous resistance is simultaneously made invisible. This ambivalence expressed towards Indigenous populations is an example of violent love. How is it possible that Indigenous culture is fetishized and fantasized in wilderness spaces, yet the real living Indigenous people in Canada experience oppression outside nature parks? Exploitation of



Indigenous populations is in plain sight in the media, yet Indigenous oppression is naturalized since they are colonial bodies. Also, Indigenous resistance in the Idle No More Movement is transformed as a media spectacle rather than taken seriously.

Key findings that have been highlighted within this chapter are the spatial violent love relationships we express towards wildlife (more specifically wolves/coyotes) and Indigenous populations. My investigation of non-park space shows that animal and Indigenous bodies are disciplined for transgressing spaces of exclusion. Discipline operates across space from wilderness parks to non-nature spaces where the violence/hatred/ambivalence is most visible. My aim in this chapter was to demonstrate the complexities of contradictions that are fluid and not static.

In **Chapter Seven** I provide some important connections and arguments on spatial representation, belonging and exclusion. In the next chapter I analyze the power of space and how space secures relations of domination and privilege in order to maintain a White humanist fantasy.

## Chapter Seven & Final Discussion: Socio-Spatial Exclusion and Invisible Boundaries that Govern Unruly Bodies

To interrogate bodies travelling in spaces is to engage in a complex historical mapping of spaces and bodies in relation, inevitably a tracking of multiple systems of domination and the ways in which they come into existence in and through each other (Razack 2002:15).

This chapter attempts to theorize why violent love operates fluidly from nature parks to spaces outside the park perimeter. Here, I continue to address my third research question: how are tourist constructions spatially organized in nature parks and urban life? While this chapter is an extension of **Chapter Six** in some ways, **Chapter Six** is an analysis of urban attitudes that highlights specific case studies and examples, whereas **Chapter Seven** focuses on how space shapes attitudes across wilderness areas (Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula) to urban areas (GTA). I discuss how space and individuals in specific spaces may appear as natural; however, a set of oppressive relations was implemented in order to create static ideas of belonging and exclusion. While I have critiqued the ‘wilderness’ as a space that involved the removal of Indigenous populations, the city is equally naturalized as a space that evolved innocently. Wolch (2002) argues that cities are solely identified as a human habitat. Beliefs that “cities are the exclusive domain of humans is widespread”, that is also the common belief within academic institutions (Wolch 2002:726). However, an animal geography theoretical framework suggests conceptions that cities are natural places ignore the removal practices that displace animal populations in order to build urban communities. Animals are rarely considered when scholars study urban space, despite the many urban animal residents.

The city, in this case the GTA is imagined as the polar opposite of nature spaces, which is why tourists travel to these spaces. The GTA is constructed as a space of development that unlike Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula is represented as full of people and lacking animals.

In **Chapters Four and Five** I highlighted the myths of what I refer to as *spatial fantasy belonging*. To clarify, I define spatial fantasy belonging as the fantasy that humans create about where animals belong. As reported in **Chapter Six** Sterba (2012) argues the spatial boundaries of nature and culture are much less static than most people believe. He argues wildlife in North America have ‘made a comeback’ and are living and sharing space with us in urban/suburban spaces. Wolch (2002) also argues that wild animals have gradually returned to more urban areas. She suggests the cause for the increase in wildlife sightings in urban areas is sprawl, which she describes as “urban encroachment into animal habitats” (Wolch 2002:731). Sterba (2012) and Wolch (2002) both suggest shifts in human attitudes towards wildlife have led to their ‘repopulation’. The White settler community is perpetually managing populations (both human and animal). The assessment of some animal communities as ‘overpopulated’ is a consequence of human related activities. For example, the near extermination of wolves in North America tremendously disrupted the ecological balance (*Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park* 2002). As a result, deer and coyote populations have thrived in some regions. Beavers are another animal that are continually described as either a suffering population or overpopulated, blamed for causing damages from dam building.

Hage (2000) also suggests White humans are perpetually managing non-White populations. He argues Whites control and police immigration levels in order to protect the White nation fantasy that allows Whites to maintain their dominant position. Hage (2000) also applies population management to non-human species:

Most humans perceive ants as a different species, and certainly as an inferior species. Yet, just on the basis of this belief, they do not perceive them as ‘undesirable’ or as ‘too many’. They do so only when these ants are seen to have invaded spaces where humans find their presence harmful such as in their houses or on their plates. And it is only in such situations that practices of violence are directed against them (Hage 2000:37-38).

I have highlighted this quote from Hage, since he is explicitly arguing discourses of ‘too many’ are embodied in racist beliefs; similarly speciesist ideologies are practices of what he defines as categories of *spatial management*. To clarify, spatial management is the managing of space. This theme of managing space is central to my research; it is a practice undertaken by White settlers to keep perceived threatening populations at a distance. What humans (more specifically Whites) perceive as overpopulated is a racist and speciesist discourse that allows White human supremacy to remain unchallenged. White people are in such a privileged social position that their ‘overpopulation’ within Canada is normalized and never subject to population management. Richard Dyer (1997) argues “Whiteness is nothing and everything at the same time”. White individuals govern the Canadian landscape and police populations they deem as threatening to the White nation.

The ‘undesirability’ of predator species, such as wolves/coyotes and Indigenous populations warrants their removal, containment, segregation, and discipline. Wolch (2002) argues humans participate in ‘zoning’ that allocates designated areas for animals and humans. Moreover, Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula would be designated as spaces for animals, yet humans use these places for tourism at their leisure. However, when animals enter urban areas that are constructed as human spaces they are deemed ‘out of place’ (especially predator species) (Wolch and Emel 1998). Many humans have developed a ‘tolerance’ for some wild animals to live in urban communities; such as, rabbits, squirrels and birds. Tolerance for certain animals to enter human areas is influenced not only by the species of the ‘invader’ but by the degree of ‘invasion’. Squirrels on our front lawn may be acceptable to many people, yet when they are going through our gardens eating our vegetables or building nests under our decks, our attitudes may change from love to hate. This is constructed as a personal transgression of space that

results in an economic loss that may influence how we view that individual animal or over time generalize that experience to the entire species. While animals are continuously zoned and policed for entering urban areas, White humans are privileged to move freely through any space with no consequences since they are the national governors.

Animals are not the only populations that are zoned. In **Chapter Six** I examined how Indigenous populations are often segregated to remote areas of Canada, whereby their oppression is contained and rendered invisible spatially to the White gaze. Reserves are designated areas where Indigenous people belong. Racist discourses that characterize them as primitive allow Indigenous people to belong in wilderness spaces. Wilderness spaces are viewed as primitive because they are radically different than everyday landscapes in cities. They are symbolically a space of time travel to an earlier time-period that Whites describe as atavistic. These spaces contribute to identity-making for Whites through the manufacturing of wilderness fantasies. Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula normalize White belonging and celebrate White achievements. Further, Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are spaces that reinforce the progress White humans have accomplished. Indigenous people in urban cities are subject to the White gaze, whereby their differences make them visible and vulnerable to experience discrimination. They are disciplined more than any other group by the Criminal Justice System and their bodies are viewed as unruly (Balfour and Comack 2006). Indigenous women are regularly disciplined by White men through practices of gendered racial violence (Razack 2002). Their bodies are viewed as unrapeable and are consumed as an extension of the colonial project (Razack 2002). Unrapeable bodies are people who are constructed as being incapable of being raped, due to ‘risky’ behaviour (i.e. drug/alcohol users, criminality, transgressing gender expectations, prostitution, and promiscuity) or simply race (Razack 2002). As a result of the intergenerational

effects of colonialism, Indigenous women are often categorized as both risky and unrapeable. Indigenous women's bodies are deemed degenerate, therefore subject to White male violence (Razack 2002). They cannot be raped, since their bodies are viewed as property of White colonists (Razack 2002).

Indigenous people are not the only racialized group that are socially excluded through spatial containment. There are many different areas within the GTA that are heavily racialized. Jane and Finch in the North York region is a racial containment zone for Black Canadians. Other communities are strongly associated with different races and cultures. Woodbridge is predominately occupied by Italians and Burlington is a strong White community. Further, downtown Toronto is full of different ethnic and racial communities that offer spaces for groups to come together and celebrate their own culture; also different groups can enjoy other cultures, while simultaneously remaining ambivalent about a specific cultural/racial group. White Canadians do not have specific spaces in the downtown region of Toronto since they are privileged to explore every space. They do not require a specific space because the nation is their entire space to which that they are granted access. Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are special spaces for White Canadians to enjoy, since these spaces symbolize their culture; the Canadian national identity (Indigenous people/culture, wildlife and wilderness). Moreover, we claim to be a multicultural nation, yet spaces are heavily coded along race/culture and species that determines belonging or exclusion.

Wolch and Emel (1998) argue we live in what they call *borderland communities* that they define as a space where “humans and animals share space uneasily” (xvi). While many Canadians identify as animal lovers (Sorenson 2010), I have revealed from this research that our relationships are spatially organized in order to maintain power over non-human animals.

Similarly, while Canadians identify as a multicultural nation this is a fantasy. Hage (2000) argues we have only become tolerant towards immigrants and racialized groups. We cannot call this a liberation celebration. Razack (2002) argues space is racialized that secures unequal power relations and my research reveals that space is speciesist. Through my research I have highlighted the racism and speciesism that is secured across spaces from places of spatial 'belonging' at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula to spaces of exclusion outside nature parks. Why do humans pull out their guns in an urban community and instead quickly grab their cameras at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula when they see predator animals? In wilderness spaces they are constructed as majestic creatures possessing intrinsic value, while urban wildlife are described as invaders and pests that require control. The radically different reactions to animals in different spaces are a consequence of the social construction of spaces that determine who belongs that thereafter shapes public attitudes.

Wolch and Emel (1998) argue landscapes are texts that must be teased out. The process of deconstructing the "social forces that created landscapes" aids in revealing the oppressors and victims of domination involved in social conflicts (xv). Foucault argues "knowledge and power were linked to the uses of space and place to isolate and exclude, to segregate and thus manage social difference" (Wolch and Emel 1998:xvi). The knowledge and social constructs humans create about animals and different racial/cultural groups are normalized as the natural ordering of social life that does not question the hierarchies and relations of domination that are enacted. Razack (2002) argues White humans come to understand who they are in relation to the 'other'. Wolch and Emel (1998) similarly argue that humans' position of domination over animals and nature is enabled through dualistic thinking that patronizes animals. Animals are ridiculed or granted less moral consideration the further they deviate from what humans consider human

physical characteristics and behaviours (Regan 2001). Bryant (2007) critiques this phenomenon employed by animal rights/welfare advocates as a hindrance to the movement. He suggests this approach reinforces hierarchies of worth based on an animal's similarities to humans, which will result in species exclusion. Bryant (2007) advocates for an appreciation of difference in order to dismantle speciesist ideologies. Razack (2002) and Wolch and Emel (1998) both argue that the identity making of human (White) groups contributes to the maintenance of power over marginalized groups (Indigenous people and animal populations).

Coexisting with 'wild' bodies is challenging, since many humans (Whites) are intolerant to what they construct as different and perceived as threatening to their role as national governors. My analysis of spatial representation has revealed that attitudes are also influenced by perceptions of 'too many' and distance. Socially constructed ideas of 'wild' create socio-spatial definitions of belonging and exclusion. Wolves and coyotes are animals who are constructed as wild and should be contained in spaces designated as wild (Jones 2002). As discussed above in **Chapter Five**, Francis (1992) argues Indigenous people are represented as primitive and wild. This association results in the normalization of inclusion of Indigenous people/culture (commodities/taxidermy) in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. Whatmore and Thorne (1998) argue specific animal species are designated as wild. They suggest "the wild occupies a special place" "without 'us' populated by creatures and uncivilized humans" (Whatmore and Thorne 1998:435). The moral geographies of the wilderness allow these groups (wildlife and Indigenous people) to belong in unpeopled (non-White 'civilized' people) spaces (Whatmore and Thorne 1998).

As exemplified in **Chapter Five**, what White humans socially construct as 'wild' is speciesist and racist. Fears of the 'other' are linked to ideas of the untamed and undomesticated.



Indigenous populations and wolves are symbols of resistance to the White nation. Importantly, both utilized the North American landscape prior to European invasion (Coleman 2004, Jones 2002). The removal of wolves and Indigenous populations was central to the colonial project. Hage (2000) argues the White nation has created an unending dream of overcoming nature that is imperative to the civilizing process. In my discussion of nature, I include the categorization of Indigenous people and wildlife since they are represented this way in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. Also, Indigenous people and wildlife are classified as nature in the wilderness discourse. Hage (2000) argues one of the oldest fantasies is what he refers to as the *ecological fantasy of domesticated nature*. This is the image of the Garden of Eden that is an ordered and manufactured experience of nature. In reality, this binary of nature and culture as imagined in the Garden of Eden fantasy is blurred. Recent news stories on urban wildlife reported in **Chapter Six** disrupt the fantasies that nature is tamed and domesticated. There are predator species entering socially constructed human spaces that confront human's naturalized belonging. Further, the fantasy of the culture-nature divide is challenged by an influx of animals entering urban areas. Fantasies that Indigenous peoples are dead or assimilated to White culture are disrupted by the Idle No More Movement that confronts the government's violation of treaty rights.

White humans as the national governors police the invisible boundaries of nature and culture. Animals, especially wolves constructed as wild and uncommodifiable are defined as the 'ultimate other' (Elder, Wolch and Emel 1998, Emel 1998). Therefore wolves/coyotes' presence outside Algonquin, Bruce Peninsula and other contained wilderness spaces is in itself a transgression of human space that warrants discipline, as exemplified in the recent cases in **Chapter Six**. Animals are not only violating invisible spatial boundaries, but also human

expectations and ideas about certain wild animals belonging in wilderness spaces. Indigenous people suffer a different type of discipline than wildlife outside nature parks. Indigenous bodies are disciplined through the endless surveillance and government control over Indigenous communities for transgressing and deviating from White standards. The discipline of wolves/coyotes that results in death highlights the extreme speciesism we express towards predator species. This level of hatred and domination is evidence we have a long battle before we can ever claim progress for wolves, contrary to popular beliefs that wolves have made a comeback. While Indigenous people are not killed for entering White human spaces, the containment of Indigenous people to reserves and poor living areas; such as, Chemical Valley in Sarnia, Ontario exemplifies the continued injustices Indigenous people experience in Canada. Both Indigenous and wolves/coyotes bodies are governed in all spatial locations for the benefits of White privilege.

Whatmore and Thorne (1998) raise an important question in their research: “to ask what is wild is a question of its whereabouts” (435). This suggests that the social construction of wild is linked to space. Further, the whereabouts is important in terms of distance that alters attitudes expressed towards wildlife and racialized groups. Space conceals and reveals to us, what the managers of the space desire to make visible and what is desirable depends on the spatial construction. Therefore, viewing wolves in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula is an accepted practice since they are constructed as belonging. However, in urban areas wolves and other predator species are viewed as ‘out of place’. This spatial exclusion in urban regions is a product of human imaginations of these spaces as an exclusively human zone. Indigenous peoples/culture are also heavily featured within Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. As indicated above in my analysis of their oppression in non-park spaces, there is a contradiction in Indigenous

representation whereby the visible injustices' these communities experience is rendered invisible.

The study of spatial relationships (representations and attitudes) is a strong theoretical tool in order to explore race and species inequality. Human supremacy is challenged as a result of the blurring of 'culture' and 'nature' as I exemplified with my urban wildlife examples. Myths of Indigenous populations and non-human animals' passivity have been disrupted through their active struggles for inclusion (both socially and economically for Indigenous people; and physically for wildlife). The violent or love relationships we choose to express towards Indigenous people and wildlife are influenced by colonial fantasies of White domination and human social constructs of spatial belonging.

## **Chapter Summary**

This chapter has provided a conceptualization of the spatial organization of relationships across space, from a wilderness space, to a space outside a sanitized nature landscape. Social constructions of space influence belonging or exclusion for Indigenous populations and wildlife, specifically wolves/coyotes and other predator species. This chapter has revealed that the spatial organization of relationships is linked to White fantasies to maintain relations of domination. This is accomplished through the construction of spatial dualisms of belonging and exclusion in order to manage and control undesirable populations.

Firstly, space is not innocent and is never empty (Razack 2002). I explored the consistent theme of the social construction of space that normalizes social-spatial belonging. Constructions of Indigenous people and wildlife as untamed and undomesticated reinforce ideas they are 'out of place' in spaces outside Algonquin, Bruce Peninsula and other nature spaces. Zoning of spaces naturalizes where certain groups of people and animals should live. The zoning of

wildlife and Indigenous people in the wilderness reinforces static notions of nature and ideas that nature is frozen in time. This contributes to racist and speciesist discourses of primitiveness and inferiority of nature (including animals and Indigenous people) in comparison to the perceived 'progress' of the White nation. While there are some levels of tolerance for wildlife entering urban communities and some legislative changes for Indigenous populations, as reported by McGill (2008), this does not suggest liberation and equality have been obtained. Our reactions of admiration or violence are also influenced by distance and perceptions of posing a threat to personal safety, or property.

In this chapter, I emphasized the importance of deconstructing space in order to understand social conflicts. Further, Razack (2002) and Wolch and Emel (1998) argue space secures interlocking relations of domination for colonized individuals. White Canadians are the spatial managers of what they perceive as their land. Further, White managers continuously manage numbers and police 'threatening' populations; such as, Indigenous people and wolves that symbolize resistance. These populations are disciplined for their transgression of space or for deviating White standards and expectations.

This chapter disrupts the illusion of 'progress' and rescue narrative that operates in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula of wolves/coyotes and Indigenous people. A spatial analysis reviewed in this chapter highlights the violent love relationships we express towards colonial bodies. These relations are highly complex and raise serious questions about why in theory we claim to love individual's that are strongly associated with our Canadian national identity, while in reality these relationships are spatially organized and the love or hate expressed towards them operates on a continuum. Now, I report my conclusion to this research.

## **Conclusion**

This research answers some important questions about contradictions and spatial organization of relationships with colonized populations that are managed and policed by the White settler society. Practically, I hope this research will be insightful to people interested in a wide range of disciplines; however, more specifically my intention was to create non-speciesist knowledge on understanding ‘progress’, roles of nature parks, and the increasing conflicts with urban wildlife predators.

Through my in-depth analysis employing critical research methods and theoretical frameworks, I have aimed to create a political project that will provoke new discussions on rethinking Whiteness and human privileges. While narratives of progress in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula disguise the colonial violence (directly or indirectly through commodification/taxidermic representation) that also operates simultaneously, I reveal the complexities of these ‘progress’ claims and report there are new forms of colonialism being enacted. Myths of progress are disabled when a spatial analysis is employed. I reveal that representation of predator species and Indigenous populations in urban and non-nature spaces are much different than in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula. Many people believe we have achieved social progress in terms of our attitudes towards colonial bodies (wolves and Indigenous people). In this research I examine how our relationships are instead spatially organized that affects our level of love, or hate (violent love). My findings aim to contribute to different academic discussions and debates from many different vantage points (ecology, environmental studies, critical race studies, geographers, and critical animal studies). This project is wide in scope and due to the complexity of the social phenomenon an interdisciplinary approach can be valuable for future research.

At a practical level, I hope my findings can contribute to urban wildlife protectors. Rapid urban and suburban expansion is depriving animals of their natural habitat and forcing them into socially constructed human spaces, therefore it is vital that we learn to coexist with them. There are a few important non-profit groups in the GTA-Niagara Falls region that promote compassionate conservation and peaceful coexistence with coyotes. Coyote Watch Canada is a group of dedicated people who promote community based education and conservation awareness. They specialize in conflict resolution, coyote protection and conduct research through field observation and data collection (Coyote Watch Canada: November 2013). The Association for the Protection of Fur-Bearing Animals is an organization in Vancouver, yet operates an important role in educating Toronto residents about living with wildlife. They are responsible for organizing an annual conference on living with wildlife and educating the public on successful coexistence. The Beach Coyote Coalition is a partnership of Coyote Watch Canada and The Association for the Protection of Fur-Bearing Animals that encourages active community involvement in Toronto (Beach Coyote Coalition: February 26, 2013). This initiative strives to achieve government support to ban feeding wildlife and also encourages the city of Toronto to implement a “coyote strategy plan”. All of these groups advocate that we must minimize interactions with coyotes in order to avoid conflict. They recommend eliminating the feeding of wildlife as the best strategy to eliminate human-wildlife conflict with coyotes’ They also suggest keeping pets’ indoors (dogs and cats), removing dog/cat food from outdoors, neutering pets, removing trash frequently and storing it indoors (i.e., the garage), not allowing birdfeeders to overflow, picking ripened fruit, reporting neighbours who feed wildlife, and teaching children about wildlife (Beach Coyote Coalition: February 26, 2013, Coyote Watch Canada: November 2013, The Association for the Protection of Fur-Bearing Animals: November 2013). They not

only report preventative strategies as mentioned above, but the groups describe steps that should be taken if an individual encounters a coyote. Some actions include: never running away, yelling at coyote and making oneself appear large by waving arms in the air, picking up children or dogs, reporting sightings to city or hotline to Coyote Watch Canada, and checking property for wildlife attractants to deter future coyotes. The groups provide more detailed strategies online and Coyote Watch Canada has produced numerous pamphlets that can be printed and shared with others. The Toronto Wildlife Center (TWC) specializes in rehabilitating wildlife, yet they are also involved in important public discussions on living with coyotes in the GTA. Coexistence will require education and financial resources, in addition to assistance from the MNR and cooperation from government at the municipal level. My project is one step that contributes to the production of knowledge that intends to challenge individuals to engage with their speciesist attitudes.

### *Summary of Findings*

I now re-iterate my key findings from this research. Firstly, in **Chapter Four** I explored the spatial contradictions that operate within Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula that focused on my research question: to what extent is violent love a dominant theme in representations and experiences of nature parks. The invisibility of exploitation is a widespread practice at these two nature parks. At Algonquin, logging practices are concealed from the tourist gaze in order to produce fantasies that Algonquin is a rugged wilderness. I also disrupted the protection narrative fantasy. While many people believe that mammals and non-human species are protected at Algonquin, hunting/trapping is permitted in specific areas of the Park and fishing is a widely accepted practice (restrictions on numbers and species), other than the few fish sanctuaries that award protection to fish in these spaces. I explore other consequences of tourism; such as, the

creation of habituated bears. Bears may enter developed campgrounds for an easy meal; however, bears that continuously come into close contact with humans may be executed. This demonstrates the continuum of violent love that operates across space within Algonquin, in addition to our attitudes towards predator species that are also shaped by distance. I also explore the Algonquin Logging Museum that normalizes the project of imperialism and nation building. Further, people express a violent love relationship with the relations that have emerged as a result of capitalism. While on the one hand, individuals travel to wilderness spaces to escape the pressures and anxieties of modernity, many tourists continue to desire the pleasures and luxuries (radios, running water, electricity, cell phone reception, etc) of capitalism while enjoying their wilderness experience.

In **Chapter Five**, I address my second research question: how are animals and Indigenous people produced relationally to manufacture nature park fantasies? I analyze the representations of wildlife and Indigenous people inside gift shops as exemplifying a new type of colonialism, referred to as commodity racism and commodity speciesism. Investigating gift shop representations revealed that all wildlife species are commodified anthropomorphically, except the wolf. This is linked to the social construction of certain animals and also is a product of humans fantasy-making about specific animals that alleviates anxiety and guilt. Another key finding through gift shop exploration was that non-human animal bodies are also sold (whole bodies or dismembered bodies/skins) within the same spaces that claim to protect them.

Indigenous people/culture is commodified in ways that appeal to White consumers that reinforces stereotypes about Indigenous people. Wildlife and Indigenous people/culture are often produced relationally in commodities. This is symbolic of colonial defeat of populations Whites deem threatening and in need of control in order for Whites to maintain their position as the



national governors. I discuss how souvenir items are never innocent and that consumption of souvenirs is not a passive activity. A critical deconstruction of moccasin commodities sold at both Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula reveals the violent love relationship we express towards wild animals and Indigenous populations. This example aids in dismantling myths of progress for oppressed social groups (colonial bodies). Death of non-human animals is normalized. The commodification of Indigenous culture and association of the fur trade (moccasins) reproduces victimization of colonized populations.

Visitor centers at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are critiqued for the myths of post-colonialism they produce. These spaces mask colonial violence and secure White hegemony through the normalization of atrocities. I observed the absence of Indigenous people in images of Algonquin painted by the Group of Seven, this representation of Canada as empty normalizes the removal of Indigenous populations. An interesting finding at the Parks is that while Indigenous people/culture are transformed into commodities and are a symbol of Canada, they (as people) are simultaneously erased in images of Canada. Animal and Indigenous human specimens are masked in rescue rhetoric, yet this ignores the privileged social position of Euro-Canadians to move freely through these spaces without discipline and being transformed into a taxidermic spectacle. Race and species hierarchies are normalized and the myth of progress conceals everyday struggles for colonized groups. I revealed that progress is a White construction. Instead there are new types of colonialism and methods of control that reproduce colonial logic under the guise of rescue. We continuously create fantasies about groups that we may fear, or deem threatening. My analysis has revealed that representations in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula are socially constructed versions of belonging in specific spaces in order to manufacture nature park fantasies that is essential to the 'wilderness' experience.

In **Chapter Six** I respond to my third research question: to what extent are tourist constructions and relationships spatially organized in nature parks and places outside fantasy wilderness spaces? This chapter reveals the spatial violent love relationship that exists over colonial bodies. Specifically, I revealed how Indigenous and animal bodies are regulated, disciplined, controlled and coded as not belonging in spaces outside what White humans have defined as wilderness. Firstly, I examined the framing of human-wildlife conflicts by the MNR, which reveals the entrenched speciesist attitudes that humans express towards non-human animals. Animals are continuously blamed and disciplined for conflicts that result in human loss or injury. My analysis revealed the complexities of coexistence for financial reasons; such as, the cost of building structural aids that would decrease wildlife fatality in busy urban areas and also more colonial/speciesist reasons why humans choose not to live peacefully with predator species.

Through my investigation of different news stories on wildlife entering urban areas, I found that distance to human communities significantly contributed to decisions to kill the animal. The Oakville coyote was framed as a perpetrator for not only trespassing an invisible boundary of nature-culture, but also the private space of an individual's backyard that resulted in a child being bitten. As a result, the Oakville coyote did not generate much public sympathy. However, public opinion on the Cabbagetown coyote extermination revealed that the public disapproved of the coyote killing. The public's response was to humanely remove and relocate the coyote. This finding is significant since it demonstrates the spatial designations humans have created, whereby some belong, while others are excluded and should obey these invisible boundaries. The Burlington bear similarly generated a sympathetic public reaction, yet unsafe distance to a human community was constructed as the problem that warranted the discipline of the bear. While education is framed as one of the most important steps to advocate for wildlife,

the type of education that is encouraged (do not feed wildlife) is often problematic and oversimplifies many structural issues of human progress that affects the lives of wildlife. An important finding I revealed through analyzing urban representation is the species discrimination humans express. Coyotes are continuously framed as carnivores and pet murderers. Yet, outdoor pet cats are also carnivores responsible for killing numerous wild animals. This demonstrates the hierarchy of worth that many humans have created about different non-human animals. I revealed the contradiction of humans reacting negatively to coyotes/wolves that eat other animals, since many humans also participate in the daily consumption of animal bodies. Our continued vilification of predator species is linked to fears of loss of human supremacy, since these animals can potentially kill and consume us. Another finding that was revealed was that not all urban cities produce the same public reactions towards coyotes entering the urban landscape. These complex attitudes are influenced by numerous factors including; distance, exposure, urban location, subjective experiences and negative encounters with wolves.

In **Chapter Six**, I also explored representations of Indigenous populations outside wilderness spaces. More specifically, I analyzed media representation of the Idle No More Movement and cases of pipeline resistance. Public opinion polls suggest that many Canadians remained ambivalent about the reserve system (National Post: January 4, 2013). We push Indigenous populations to remote areas of Canada that conceals the injustices and oppression they experience. Pipeline projects are advocated as beneficial for the economy, yet often pose hazards to Indigenous communities and are a violation of water and land rights. Indigenous populations are recolonized by the oil companies/government that builds pipelines through colonized communities. Further, pipeline projects demonstrate the violent love relationship we express towards earth and non-human species that would be devastated by an oil spill disaster.

Support for the pipeline exemplifies the continued pursuit to obtain economic progress and development over nature. I explore how visible issues and Indigenous resistance is able to simultaneously be made invisible. Indigenous culture is fetishized and celebrated at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula, yet in spaces outside the Parks' their oppression is normalized, regardless of the fact that their exploitation is in plain sight in the media. The oppression Indigenous people experience is naturalized as a result of their legacy of colonization. I also explore how the Idle No More Movement is transformed into a mass media spectacle, rather than taken seriously. Moreover, my findings reveal that colonial bodies (coyotes/wolves and Indigenous people) are disciplined for crossing into spaces of exclusion. This chapter highlighted the spatial organization of relationships and exemplified how the violent love phenomenon operates across space that is complex and multilayered.

In **Chapter Seven**, I also explored the research question: how are tourist constructions and relationships spatially organized in nature parks and places outside fantasy wilderness spaces? In this chapter I discussed how social constructions of space influence belonging, or exclusion for wildlife and Indigenous populations. My findings suggest that spatial organization of relationships is linked to White fantasies in order to maintain relations of domination. Policing spatial dualisms of belonging and exclusion is a tool to manage and control undesirable populations. I reveal the importance of understanding social constructions in order to examine the appearance of 'things'. Constructions of individuals and space normalize socio-spatial belonging. Groups categorized as 'wild' (wolves/coyotes and Indigenous populations) are viewed as 'out of place' in White human communities. In this chapter I revealed the importance of deconstructing meanings of space in order to understand social conflicts. Meanings that are embedded within and socially constructed about space produce false 'truths' to casual observers.

White Canadians manage numbers and police who they perceive as threatening. Both wolves/coyotes and Indigenous populations are disciplined for the resistance they embody, transgression of spaces and for deviating White expectations. Through my examination of space in its entirety in this chapter I was able to disrupt myths of progress in a meaningful way. While in **Chapters Four and Five** I explore more clandestine forms of violent love, the violence and discipline I reveal in **Chapter Six** suggests we remain attached to colonial world views of individual's we perceive as non-conforming to White society or pose threats to capitalist agendas. Moreover, a spatial analysis has revealed the dominant theme of violent love relationships we engage with colonial bodies.

### *Key Findings from Research*

Some of the major findings from this research include:

- Wilderness parks conceal violence or practices that would disrupt the wilderness fantasy experience through what I call the *invisibility of exploitation*.
- New types of colonialism are enacted in nature parks through commodification and narratives of rescue.
- Violent love operates across a continuum from wilderness spaces to urban life that is influenced by distance and social constructions of spatial belonging. This phenomenon is a contradiction to our Canadian national identity.
- Progress is a White fantasy that can be disrupted when analyzing colonial bodies in different spaces.

### *Final Thoughts*

A key question that has surfaced during my investigation of this research project is why is the Canadian national identity a fantasy, when in reality as this research has revealed, our relationships with wildlife, Indigenous people and nature is much more complex and less celebrated than many people may assume? A spatial analysis reveals that the individuals we fantasize about the most at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula (wolves and Indigenous people), are also the same groups that have endured colonial violence and that are policed and disciplined in areas outside nature parks. Analyzing space is a powerful tool in order to reveal interlocking relations of colonial domination. The colonial lens of this research is important to highlight since a major goal of this research has been to challenge the idea that colonialism is over and these ‘inconvenient’ groups have disappeared. Firstly, I have attempted to exemplify the need and importance to understand colonialism through a non-speciesist lens. Humans (Indigenous populations) are not the only populations that are colonized in order for the White settler society to manage the nation according to White imperial projects. I hope this research provides convincing insights to scholars who are resistant to animal liberation arguments. Hopefully this lens of analysis can provide some reflection to individuals who may contribute to reproducing speciesism. Further, for some individuals my goal is to only raise consciousness of their own contradictions. Consciousness of our contradictions is one of the first steps towards social justice. As I mentioned in the introduction, this thesis itself is a product of my own reflection of contradictions. Many people identify as an animal or nature lover although their everyday practices are not aligned with these identity claims. These contradictions have led me to challenge my existing beliefs and to embrace a critical perspective.

We create fantasies about others and internalize false identities during a period in social history when many of us are confused on our identity. We live in a world where we are distanced

and removed from nature (Sterba 2012). We create myths about how Canadians are a multicultural society that include Indigenous symbolism in our Canadian national identity in order to alleviate guilt over our history of abuse (Francis 1992, Francis 1997). We are removed from the land, agriculture and many sources of production (Pachirat 2011, Schlosser 2002). In an oppressive social world, whereby we have become alienated by the social forces of capitalism, fantasy making is essential in order to negotiate harsh realities. Therefore, the illusion of progress is a master narrative fantasy that leads people to believe 'we have come a long way'. As I revealed in this research the master narrative of progress is entrenched in Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula.

Notions of progress are everywhere; including academic institutions, policy making and a large number of the population has accepted artificial beliefs that we have made significant social advancements. For example, Wise (2009) argues that the success and election of Barack Obama does not signify liberation and the elimination of White racism. Wise (2009) instead classifies this as a new kind of racism that he refers to as Racism 2.0, which is more insidious and dangerous than traditional practices of racism. While Obama is the exception he becomes a marker of an individual who was able to transcend his blackness (Wise 2009). Wise (2009) argues the election of Obama has resulted in more expectations for Black populations in the U.S. that fails to account for experiences of systemic racial discrimination. Similarly, while many people believe women have been emancipated and liberated, women remain oppressed and subjugated by men globally (Balfour and Comack 2006, Farr 2005). Myth making at Algonquin, Bruce Peninsula and many other spaces reproduces ideas that Indigenous people are a disappearing culture. We create the illusion that we have progressed and overcome our colonial ways with Indigenous people. This research has exposed that inside Algonquin, Bruce Peninsula

and non-nature spaces; Indigenous populations continue to experience colonialism. While spaces such as Algonquin contribute to myths that wolves have been emancipated and protected since the wolf restoration programs in the 1960s, I revealed the spatial complexities of this protection and demonstrated that attitudes towards wolves/coyotes shift profoundly across space and distance. According to the *Wild & Free Press*, wolf bounty programs in Alberta are under consideration (Sept. 2012). Since this discussion in 2012, there has been a decision to allow wolf bounties that are being paid out by third private parties (Rocky Mountain Outlook: May 2, 2013). The reason for the implementation of wolf bounties in Alberta has been a result of wolves' eating cattle and hunters outcry over a decrease in available animals to kill (Rocky Mountain Outlook: May 2, 2013). The justifications for the wolf bounty reimplementation mentioned in the Rocky Mountain Outlook, exemplify the contemporary colonial discourses that vilify wolves for threatening human interests that often result in their extermination. In this research I have exposed how coyotes are exterminated when they enter urban areas. Therefore, claiming wolves/coyotes have made progress is a delusion. However, perceptions of rescue in wilderness spaces reinforce these fantasies to tourists.

We are driven by ideas of perpetual and linear progress that aids in providing a false sense of hope in a social world of conflict and disparity. Therefore we negotiate our identities across space as we are continuously conflicted in our attitudes towards colonized individuals. While on the one hand, we admire them, on the other, we fear them. The presence of predator animals in urban communities threatens our belonging and human supremacy. If the culture-nature divide merges and animals are moving into what are perceived as human spaces, this asks humans to forfeit some of their privileges by coexisting and space sharing. While Canadians may claim we are a multicultural nation, Hage (2000) argues myths of multiculturalism are a fantasy.



While of course there are many people who are not racist, regrettably there is also a large population of people who retain racist attitudes and stereotypes (Hage 2000, Wise 2009). According to Hage (2000), many people are only tolerant to difference and racialized others. He suggests many Whites are only tolerant because we have to be, not out of our own desires. As this research has revealed the colonial project remains interact and alive, whereby new practices of colonialism have hidden the same anticipated outcome of White human domination.

At the end of this research I find myself more pessimistic than when I started. I experienced amazement at the level of contradictions that were revealed as I delved into this research. Despite my cynicism about progress and claims of living in a post-colonial world (human and non-human animals), I retain my conviction that revealing contradictions can aid in dismantling fantasies and result in a shift in attitudes. Taking responsibility and acknowledging our contradictions through self-reflexivity can lead to collective consciousness. Thereafter this may influence some people to change their ideologies and reject human and White supremacy. Of course a single project will not solve this problem. As I have mentioned throughout this thesis, this research is only one analysis and further inquiry is needed. However, I am advocating the importance of having scholars to understand the power of contradictions and analyze space. While many scholars analyze contradictions, this entire thesis has revolved around answering questions about contradictions (violent love) since they are an organizing principle of life. Research, knowledge and unlearning privileges begin with you. I believe this project provides some important insights that can contribute to something much bigger through further investigation.

## Limitations and Pathways for Further Research

### *Limitations*

In **Chapter Two** I highlighted some limitations of this research, including the researcher subjectivity involved in a critical discourse analysis and participant observation. Deconstructing social artifacts and providing a self-reflexive narrative raises concerns to researcher bias and ethics. All researchers are members of the social world (Wolfer 2007). Therefore their experiences will affect their world views that shape and impact the research. Every individual has an agenda that motivates their research. This agenda can drive the research and this passion keeps activists and academics committed to social justice issues (Conney 2011). However, the same motivation that keeps academics/activists dedicated to their research/work can result in biases in order to produce research aligned with their agenda or affirm an individual's own self identity or belief system (Conney 2011). While all qualitative social research is highly subjective and suffers validity threats and generalizability concerns according to Wolfer (2007); qualitative research is an invaluable tool in order to explore social phenomena and subjective social experiences.

A significant measure for good research ethics is to engage in researcher reflexivity (Shenton 2004). Throughout all stages of this research I have attempted to be reflexive of my own social position and White human privilege, while studying victims of colonial abuse and violence. I have also demonstrated my commitment to conduct this research through a non-speciesist lens that respects non-human animals' subjectivity, as well as considers animals' own personal interests that are separate from humans. Further, I have noted that Indigenous perspectives provide a different standpoint on cultural appropriation and the larger systemic forms of discrimination that Indigenous populations continue to experience.

My interest has been in analyzing power relations of the White settler society in order to understand the colonial relations involved in the violent love relationship this thesis has examined. As a result, I designed this project with careful consideration in terms of adopting an anti-oppressive framework. I have attempted to ensure that my methods and theoretical framework are both critical and reflexive of power concerning marginalized groups. Like Daniel Francis (1992) and Tim Wise (2009), I have attempted to use my White privilege to benefit oppressed groups through exposing the continued colonial relationships that operate across space. As Wise (2009) argues, regrettably we live in a world where Whiteness is still everything. Critiquing Whiteness as a White researcher will hopefully challenge White readers to rethink their privileges through the lens of violent love. Other scholars also suggest that members from groups that inflict damage should confront oppression. For example, Kaufman (2011), like Wise (2009), argues men who are the perpetrators of most violence against women should be more active in social activism and struggles in ending global violence against women.

Another limitation is that while I originally planned to conduct a case study on Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula in comparison to non-park areas, the results and data are weighted more from Algonquin. The justification for this is that Algonquin had more accessible literature to analyze (for example: park pamphlets, newspaper and research studies). Further, Algonquin revealed more information on wildlife representation that was important to my goal to fill a research gap through a non-speciesist lens.

While this research was interested in both wildlife and Indigenous populations, I have focused more on wildlife. My motivation was rooted in the desire to produce more knowledge on animals through a critical animal studies framework. I have centered animals in my thesis in order to highlight the need for more research, especially on challenges of coexistence with urban

wildlife. My intention has been to raise questions and challenge readers to rethink why we have such complex relationships with colonial bodies. Most research that focuses on colonialism only refers to the colonialism experience by Indigenous people. Thus, I have focused my research more on animals, since moral consideration of the lives of animals is often ignored in academic scholarship. Further, scholars who do explore colonialism often use animals in their analysis in order to explain how this is dehumanizing to Indigenous populations, which reproduces speciesism (Wakeham 2008).

Another limitation for this project was the time-frame. This was an ambitious thesis investigation that integrated information from a wide range of areas. A different approach could have been to only focus on Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula, or to only study wildlife and not Indigenous populations. However, the goal of my project was to understand the widespread phenomenon of violent love and contradictions associated with the Canadian national identity. Therefore, I would not have been able to address my research questions to the extent that I have accomplished. On the other hand, by attempting to cover too much material there was important information that I may have glossed over or not analyzed exhaustively.

Finally, as mentioned in **Chapter Two** it may be challenging to generalize my findings to different countries and nature parks throughout Canada. Also, the news stories I use in **Chapter Six** are locally situated and the results may change if a similar study is employed in a different region. On the other hand, Wolfer (2007) reports purposive sampling is acceptable to research a case study with possibilities for future research.

Not all these limitations are resolvable. This thesis was designed as an exploratory case study that aimed to only begin to offer new insights on contradictions and the challenges of the Canadian national identity through a spatial analysis. While this research is not conclusive, the

goal was to offer new ideas to scholars who can explore this research area more extensively in the future. Despite the limitations that I have identified, this thesis has revealed opaque relations of power. Hopefully this research will contribute to discussions about the negative and ambivalent attitudes expressed towards Indigenous people. Lastly, I have sought to raise awareness and consciousness to the urban wildlife challenges. I hope that my research will encourage people to re-evaluate their relationships with predator species that share this planet with us.

### *Possibilities for Further Research*

This research has been a political project that has aimed to examine complex relationships that organize human and non-human species lives. While Razack (2002) and Wolch and Emel (1998) argue that space reveals relations of domination and oppression, there are always weaknesses attached to all social research methods, which is why research should be reproduced utilizing different research methods (Wolfer 2007). A spatial analysis has been a fruitful method in order to explore the research area within the time-frame of a MA thesis. While this research has revealed important findings through a spatial analysis of Algonquin, Bruce Peninsula and non-park spaces in Ontario, other methods may provide a deeper sociological analysis. As mentioned above, the goal of this research was not to offer conclusive findings. This was an exploratory study that aimed to offer new insights on an important phenomenon that operates within Canadian society. Regardless of the usefulness of studying space in order to examine violent love relationships, an essential pathway for further research on this study area would be to employ in-depth qualitative interviews.

Wolfer (2007) argues qualitative interviewing can lead to obtaining access to important information that contributes to the field of social justice and sociology. Despite the limitations of

a qualitative research design, this research method provides a rich context that reveals individuals experiences in a significant way that many research methods are unable to accomplish. Interviewing participants could offer different insights and new directions of knowledge that this research was unable to explore. This would be an effective step forward to extend this thesis into a larger research investigation.

While in this study I inserted myself as the demographic of study (White, human and living in an urban area situated near the events this thesis explored), studying a larger sample would likely reveal significant understandings of contradictions associated with the Canadian national identity. The sample should be a group of people that travel to Algonquin and/or Bruce Peninsula that also live in an urban area recently encountering wildlife coexistence challenges. Further, including Indigenous perspectives would provide insight on their experiences of new forms of colonialism in nature parks that I mentioned in **Chapter Five**. Also, it would be interesting to find Indigenous animal rights activists to interview in order to highlight the similar colonial experiences and struggles. This perspective could challenge White myths that all Indigenous populations endorse the harvesting and consumption of animal bodies.

Further research should be undertaken on the importance of education and attitudes towards vilified groups. As I reported in the literature review (**Chapter One**), Kellert's (1985) national study on attitudes towards animals revealed the significant link between education and positive attitudes towards predator species. An interesting future study could evaluate the increase in police intervention with urban wildlife, since the government (MNR) made budget cuts to the Bear Wise program in 2012. This study should highlight the importance of non-speciesist education on wildlife at educational institutions. Also a research project employing the method of participant action research (PAR) could be a useful approach in order to confront

social issues of living with wildlife. PAR would be a fruitful method to approach urban wildlife challenges, since this method is geared towards communities and collective inquiry. Therefore, this research could contribute to offering different communities knowledge to individually develop plans on how to successfully learn to coexist with urban wildlife that would not involve violent discipline (extermination).

While I examine socially constructed nature spaces (Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula) and different urban areas in Ontario, my research does not examine rural community attitudes/representations. Firstly, this thesis originated as a case study at Algonquin and Bruce Peninsula that would examine the violent love relationships tourists experience in these specific spaces. After investigation during the literature review, it became obvious to me that space and distance are significant factors that should be studied in order to evaluate our relationships with groups we fear (colonial bodies). Therefore, I expanded the scope of the thesis to include an analysis of non-park representation, more specifically urban areas in order to highlight the contradictory attitudes that operate across space. However, discussions of rural communities were neglected as a result of time constraints to conduct a MA investigation.

As reported in the literature review, Figari and Skogen (2011) conducted focus groups in Eastern Norway on rural residents' attitudes towards wolves' recovery. They concluded that conflicts with wolves are related to the social construction of the wolf as wild, in addition to their bodies not being viewed as belonging in rural human spaces. Kellert, Black, Rush and Bath (1995) report that rural residents of the Rocky Mountains express negative attitudes towards predator species when they threaten rural economic survival and personal property. Further, Figari and Skogen (2011) suggest rural residents expressed concern over threats of rural identity if they were to share space with wolves. Future research could be conducted on rural residents

living near the Algonquin Park region that would employ interviewing or focus group methods. This would be an interesting study since in **Chapter Four** I mentioned that some areas neighbouring Algonquin are responsible for the death of many wolves annually (*Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park* 2002). This research could provide insight on rural living in an Ontario context on an important predator species (coywolf) that is now entering the GTA area. A study on people living with predator species could reveal some of the coexistence issues that will arise as the urban wildlife populations continue to increase.

Another direction of study could be to interview local residents in the Bruce Peninsula region in order to understand their attitudes towards predator species, as well as Indigenous populations (nearby reserve) that live in close proximity to White rural regions. Studying rural attitudes provides a different lens of analysis than my research, since these are not fantasy spaces. Rural areas are spaces of routine coexistence that can provide important research data on relationships White Canadians express towards colonial bodies contemporarily. Further, this research can aid in challenging myths of progress that is an important step if we are to dismantle power relations towards marginalized groups.

Finally, it would be fascinating to reproduce these findings at a larger scale in a Canadian context. Churchill, Manitoba would be an ideal space to conduct this type of research. This is a space where there are high levels of polar bear tourism, as well as over 70% of the population is Indigenous according to the town of Churchill website. Churchill represents the Canadian nomadic fantasy and it would be interesting to investigate how bears are perceived by local residents in comparison to the elite tourists that consume spectacles of the bears and Indigenous populations. Moreover, this could provide further understandings on spatial contradictions of groups associated with the Canadian national identity. Lastly, similar research to my thesis could



be conducted on United States nature parks in order to examine if violent love is only a Canadian phenomenon, and if not, to what degree.

Overall, I would be interested to see more research conducted on wildlife through a non-speciesist lens. This research area is imperative as more wild animals are entering large metropolitan areas of Canada and elsewhere, a situation that urgently requires our moral consideration.

## References

- Adams, Carol J. *"The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory"*. Twentieth Anniversary Edition. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc, 2010.
- Algonquin Park. Accessed May 2013, online.  
<http://www.algonquinpark.on.ca/foap/purpose/index.php>
- Amnesty International Canada. *"Issues: Indigenous Peoples": No More Stolen Sisters*.  
<http://www.amnesty.ca/our-work/issues/indigenous-peoples/no-more-stolen-sisters>
- Anderson, Virginia DeJohn. *Creatures of Empire: How Domesticated Animals Transformed Early America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Animal Law in Canada. *"Dog Owners Liability Act"*. Accessed May 2013, online.  
<http://www.animallaw.ca/index.php/dog-bites>
- Antennae: The Journal of Nature in Visual Culture. *"Botched Taxidermy"*. Issue 7, Autumn 2008, online. <http://www.antennae.org.uk/ANTENNAE%20ISSUE%207.doc.pdf>
- Andrews, Ted. *Animal Speak: The Spiritual and Magical Powers of Creatures Great & Small*. Woodbury: Llewellyn Publications, 1993.
- Baker, Jody. (2002). "Production and Consumption of Wilderness in Algonquin Park" in *Space & Culture*. 5.3, 198-210.
- Balfour and Comack. *Criminalizing Women*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2006. Editors.
- Beach Coyote Coalition. February 26, 2013, online.  
<http://beachcoyotecoalition.org/2013/02/26/who-is-bcc/>
- Bekoff, Marc. *The Animal Manifesto: Six Reasons for Expanding our Compassion Footprint*. Novato: New World Library, 2010.
- Bekoff, Marc. *The Emotional Lives of Animals: A Leading Scientist Explores Joy, Sorrow, and Empathy-and Why They Matter*. Novato: New World Library, 2007.
- Beston, Henry. *The Outermost House*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1928.
- Bird, Elizabeth. *Savage Desires: The gendered construction of the American Indian in Popular media*. 2001. *Selling the Indian: Commercializing and Appropriating American Indian Cultures*. Editors: Meyer, Carter Jones and Diana Royer.

- Bracken, Denis C., Lawrence Deane and Larry Morrisette. (2009). "Desistance and Social Marginalization: the Case of Canadian Indigenous Offenders" in *Theoretical Criminology*. 13. 1, 61-78; 1362-4806.
- Briggs, Lisa. 2003. Mother, Child, Race, Nation: The Visual Iconography of Rescue and the Politics of Transnational and Transracial Adoption in *Gender & History*. 15.2, 179-200.
- Brownlow, Alec. 2000. "A Wolf in the Garden: Ideology and Change in the Adirondack Landscape" in *Animal Spaces, Beastly Places*. Eds. Chris Philo and Chris Wilbert. London: Routledge.
- Buch, Elena D. And Karen M. Staller. 2001. "The Feminist Practice of Ethnography" in *Feminist Research Practice: A Primer*. Eds, Sharlene N. Hesse-Biber & Patricia L. Leavy. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Bryant, Taimie L. 2007. Similarity or Difference as a Basis for Justice: Must Animals Be Like Humans to be Legally Protected from Humans in "Law & Contemporary Problems". 70, 207-253.
- Braithwaite, Victoria. *Do Fish Feel Pain?* New York: Oxford University Press Inc, 2010.
- Bulbeck, Chilla. 2005. *Facing the Wild: Ecotourism, Conservation and Animal Encounters*. London: Bath Press.
- Byrne, Jason. (2012). "When Green is White: The Cultural Politics of Race, Nature and Social Exclusion in a Los Angeles Urban National Park" in *Geoforum*. 43, 595-611.
- Byrne, Jason and Jennifer Wolch. (2009). "Nature, Race and Parks: Past Research and Future Directions for Geographic Research" in *Progress in Human Geography*. 33.6, 743-765.
- Cambronne, C., Goldberg, M., Schuster, M., & Smith, K. (1992). The International Wolf Center: Team Field Project Report.
- Campbell, Colin, T. And Thomas M. Campbell II. *The China Study: The Most Comprehensive Study of Nutrition Ever Conducted and the Startling Implications for Diet, Weight Loss and Long-term Health*. Dallas: Benbella Books Inc, 2006.
- Canada Goose Fur Policy. Accessed April 2012, online. <http://www.canada-goose.com/fur-policy/>. Link is no longer active (changed website).
- Canada Goose Fur Policy Video. Accessed April 2012, online. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vzqx60NERhw>
- Canadian Geographic. "The Truth About Polar Bears: What Scientists are Really Saying". Vol 132. No 6. Print.

- Canadian Geographic Travel. "Go North". Spring 2013, print.
- CBC. "The Nature of Things: Meet the Coywolf". September 12, 2013, online.  
<http://www.cbc.ca/natureofthings/episode/meet-the-coywolf.html>
- CBC Hamilton. "Enbridge Pipeline Protestors Close Ontario Highway". May 6, 2013, online.  
<http://www.cbc.ca/hamilton/news/story/2013/05/06/hamilton-enbridge-line-9-protest.html>
- CBC News Canada. "9 Questions about Idle No More." Jan 5, 2013, online.  
<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2013/01/04/f-idlenomore-faq.html>
- CBC News Toronto. "Coyote Shot Near Toronto After Girl Bitten". Jan 20, 2012, online.  
<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/story/2012/01/20/toronto-oakville-coyote.html>
- CBC News Windsor. "Coyote-hunting an Ontario Tourist Attraction? Tourism Board Promotes 'Predator-hunting, Though Effectiveness in Doubt'". Feb 19, 2013, online.  
<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/windsor/story/2013/02/18/wdr-coyote-hunting-tourism.html>
- Churchill, Ward. *A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas 1492 to the Present*. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1997.
- CityNews Toronto. "Police Shoot and Kill Coyote in Cabbagetown". Feb 11, 2013, online.  
<http://www.citynews.ca/2013/02/11/large-coyote-killed-in-cabbagetown/>
- Coleman, Jon T. *Vicious: Wolves and Men in America*. London: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Collard, Andree and Joyce Contrucci. *Rape of the Wild: Man's Violence against Animals and the Earth*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- Cooney, Nick. *Change of Heart: What Psychology Can Teach Us About Spreading Social Change*. New York: Lantern Books, 2011.
- Cosgrove, D. (1995). Habitable Earth: Wilderness, Empire and Race in America. In *Wild Ideas*. Editor: Rothenberg, D. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 27-41.
- CP24. "Police Shoot, Kill 'Aggressive' Coyote in Cabbagetown." Feb 12, 2013, online.  
<http://www.cp24.com/news/police-shoot-kill-aggressive-coyote-in-cabbagetown-1.1153195>
- Cronin, Keri J. *Manufacturing National Park Nature: Photography, Ecology, and the Wilderness Industry of Jasper*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011.

- Crosby, Marcia. 2007. Construction of the Imaginary Indian. In *Beyond Wilderness: The Group of Seven, Canadian Identity and Contemporary Art*. Editors: John O'Brian and Peter White. Singapore: McGill-Queen's University Press. 219-222.
- CTV News. "Toronto Wildlife Organization Condemns Coyote Killing". February 12, 2013, online. <http://toronto.ctvnews.ca/toronto-wildlife-organization-condemns-coyote-killing-1.1153300>
- Culhane, Dara. 2009. Their Spirits Live Within Us: Indigenous Women in Downtown Eastside Vancouver Emerging Into Visibility. In *Keeping the Campfires Going: Indigenous Women's Activism in Urban Communities*. Edited by: Susan A. Krouse and Heather A Howard. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. 76-92.
- De Leeuw, Sarah. 2011. Intimate Colonialisms: The Material and Experienced Places of British Columbia's Residential Schools. In *The Gendered Society Reader*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Canadian ed. Editors: Michael S. Kimmel, Amy Aronson and Amy Kaler. Don Mills: Oxford University Press. 212-222.
- Desmog Canada. "Line 9 Protest in Ontario's Chemical Valley". May 20, 2013, online. <http://www.desmog.ca/2013/05/20/line-9-protest-ontario-s-chemical-valley>
- Dubinsky, Karen. 2004. Local Colour: The Spectacle of Race at Niagara Falls in *Racism eh? A Critical inter-disciplinary anthology of race and racism in Canada*, ed. Camille A. Nelson, Charmaine A. Nelson. Concord, ON: Captus Press.
- Dunaway, Finis. (2000). "Hunting with the Camera: Nature Photography, Manliness, and Modern Memory, 1890-1930" in *Journal of American Studies*. 34. 2, 207-230.
- Dunayer, Joan. *Speciesism*. Derwood: Ryce Publishing, 2004.
- Eisnitz, Gail A. *Slaughterhouse: The Shocking Story of Greed, Neglect, and Inhumane Treatment Inside the U.S. Meat Industry*. Amherst: Prometheus Books, 2007.
- Elder, Glen, Jennifer Wolch and Jody Emel. 1998. Le Pratique Sauvage: Race, Place, and the Human-Animal Divide. In *Animal Geographies: Place, Politics, and Identity in Nature-Culture Borderlands*. Edited by: Jennifer Wolch and Jody Emel. London: Verso. 72-90.
- Emberley, Julia. *The Cultural Politics of Fur*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1997.
- Emel, Jody. 1998. Are you Man Enough, Big and Bad Enough? Wolf Eradication in the U.S. In *Animal Geographies: Place, Politics, and Identity in the Nature-Culture Borderlands*. Eds, J. Wolch & J. Emel. London: Verso. 91-116.
- Explore the Bruce: Official Tourism Site of Bruce County. <http://www.explorethebruce.com/>

- Fairclough, Norman. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2010.
- Farr, Kathryn. *Sex Trafficking: The Global Market in Women and Children*. New York: Worth Publishers, 2005.
- Figari, Helene and Ketil Skogen. (2011). "Social Representations of the Wolf" in *Acta Sociologica*. 54. 4, 317-332.
- Financial Post-Energy. "Ontario Municipalities Raise Oil Spill Concerns on Enbridge Pipeline Reversal". March 25, 2013, online. [http://business.financialpost.com/2013/03/25/ontario-municipalities-raise-oil-spill-concerns-on-enbridge-pipeline-reversal/?\\_\\_lsa=701b-46ff](http://business.financialpost.com/2013/03/25/ontario-municipalities-raise-oil-spill-concerns-on-enbridge-pipeline-reversal/?__lsa=701b-46ff)
- Francione, Gary. *Introduction to Animal Rights*. Philadelphia: Temple University, 2000.
- Francis, Daniel. *The Imaginary Indian: the Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1992.
- Francis, Daniel. *National Dreams: Myth, Memory, and Canadian History*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1997.
- Franke, Mark F.N. 2007. "Self-Determination versus Determination of the Self: a Critical Reading of the Colonial Ethics Inherent in the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples" in *Journal of Global Ethics*. 3. 3, 359-379.
- Fudge, Erica. *Perceiving Animals: Humans and Beasts In Early Modern English Culture*. First Illinois Paperback, 2002.
- Global Action Network. n.d. "Fur and Indigenous People". Accessed March 2012, online. <<http://www.gan.ca/campaigns/fur+trade/factsheets/fur+and+Indigenous+people.en.html>
- Grambo, Rebecca L and Photographs by Daniel J. Cox. *Wolf: Legend, Enemy, Icon*. Richmond Hill: Firefly Books Ltd, 2008.
- Great Plains Tar Sands Resistance: No Keystone XL Pipeline. <http://gptarsandsresistance.org/>
- Guillemin, Marilys and Lynn Gillam (2004). "Ethics, Reflexivity, and Ethically Important Moments in Research" in *Qualitative Inquiry*. 10, 2, 261-280.
- Hage, Ghassen. *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*. New York: Routledge in Association with Pluto Press, 2000.
- Harding, Robert. (2006). "Historical Representations of Indigenous People in the Canadian News Media" in *Discourse & Society*. 17. 2, 205-235.
- Hermer, Joe. *The Nature of Order in North American Parks: Regulating Eden*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

Herzog, Hal. *Some We Love, Some We Hate, Some We Eat: Why It's So Hard To Think Straight About Animals*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2010.

Hill, Richard William. 2007. Graveyard and Giftshop: Fighting over the McMichael Canadian Art Collection. In *Beyond Wilderness: The Group of Seven, Canadian Identity and Contemporary Art*. Editors: John O'Brian and Peter White. Singapore: McGill-Queen's University Press. 211-216.

Hollingsworth, Paul. 1990. "Natives and the Fur Industry". *The Peace Newsletter* October. <http://www.peacecouncil.net/history/PNLs1981-90/PNL576-1990.pdf>

Houston, Melanie J., Jeremy T. Bruskotter and David Fan. (2010). "Attitudes Toward Wolves in the United States and Canada: A Content Analysis of the Print News Media, 1999-2008" in *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*. 15, 389-403.

Huckin, T. N. 2007. Critical Discourse Analysis. In *Functional Approaches to Written Text*. Editor: T. Miller. Washington. 78-92.

Ishay, Micheline. *The History of Human Rights*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Jasen, Patricia. *Wild Things: Nature, Culture, and Tourism in Ontario 1790-1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.

Jessup, Lynda. 2007. Art for a Nation? In *Beyond Wilderness: The Group of Seven, Canadian Identity and Contemporary Art*. Editors: John O'Brian and Peter White. Singapore: McGill-Queen's University Press. 187-193.

Jessup, Lynda. 2002. Hard Inclusion. In *On Aboriginal Representation in the Gallery*. Editors: Lynda Jessup and Shannon Bagg. Hull: Canadian Museum of Civilization. Xiii-xxx.

Johnson, Holly. 2012. Limits of a Criminal Justice Response: Trends in Police and Court Processing of Sexual Assault. In *Sexual Assault in Canada: Law, Legal Practice and Women's Activism*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press. 613-634.

Jones, Karen R. *Wolf Mountains: A History of Wolves along the Great Divide*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2002.

Jones, Karen. (2010). "From Big Bad Wolf to Ecological Hero: Canis Lupus and the Culture (s) of Nature in the American-Canadian West" in *American Review of Canadian Studies*. 40. 3, 338-350.

Kalof, Linda, Amy Fitzgerald and Lori Baralt. (2004). "Animals, Women, and Weapons: Blurred Sexual Boundaries in the Discourse of Sport Hunting" in *Society & Animals*. 12.3, 237-251.

- Karlson, Jens and Magnus Sjostrom. (2007). "Human Attitudes Towards Wolves, a Matter of Distance" in *Biological Conservation*. 137, 610-616.
- Kaufman, Michael. 2011. The White Ribbon Campaign: Involving Men and Boys in Ending Global Violence against Women. In *The Gendered Society Reader*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Canadian ed. Editors: Michael S. Kimmel, Amy Aronson and Amy Kaler. Don Mills: Oxford University Press. 429- 437.
- Kellert, Stephen R. (1985). "Public Perceptions of Predators, Particularly the Wolf and Coyote" in *Biological Conservation*. 31, 167-189.
- Kellert, Stephen R., Matthew Black, Collen Reid Rush and Alistair J. Bath. (1995). "*Human Culture and Large Carnivore Conservation in North America*" in *Conservation Biology*. 10. 4, 977-990.
- Kim, Claire Jean. 2011. "Moral Extensionism or Racist Exploitation? The Use of Holocaust and Slavery Analogies in the Animal Liberation Movement" in *New Political Science*. 33.3, 311-333.
- Kimmel, Michael S. And Jacqueline Holler. The Gendered Family: Gender at the Heart of the Home in *The Gendered Society*, Canadian ed. Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- King, Ross. *Defiant Spirits: The Modernist Revolution of the Group of Seven*. Vancouver: D & M Publishers Inc, 2010.
- Littlefield, Jon. (2010). "Men on the Hunt: Ecofeminist Insights into Masculinity" in *Marketing Theory*. 10.1, 97-117.
- Living with Wildlife Conference* (2<sup>nd</sup> Annual). Toronto, Ontario. September 28, 2012.
- Lemelin, Harvey R. (2006). "The Gawk, the Glance, and the Gaze: Ocular Consumption and Polar Bear Tourism in Churchill, Manitoba, Canada" in *Current Issues in Tourism*. 9. 6, 516-534.
- Lemelin, Raynald H. and Elaine C. Wiersma. (2007). "Gazing upon Nanuk, the Polar Bear: the Social and Visual Dimensions of the Wildlife Gaze in Churchill, Manitoba" in *Polar Geography*. 30. 1-2, 37-53.
- Loo, Tina. *States of Nature*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006.
- Lopez, Barry. *Of Wolves and Men*. New York: Scribner, 1978.
- Luke, Brian. *Brutal: Manhood and the Exploitation of Animals*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2007.



- Luke, Brian. (1998). "Violent Love: Hunting, Heterosexuality, and the Erotic's of Men's Predation" in *Feminist Studies*. 24. 3, 627-655.
- MailOnline News. "Mum, the Bear is Eating Me: Frantic Final Phone Calls of Woman, 19, Eaten Alive by Brown Bear and its Three Cubs." August 17, 2011.  
<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2026914/Mum-bear-eating--Final-phone-calls-woman-19-eaten-alive-brown-bear-cubs.html>
- McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- McGill, Jena. (2008). "An Institutional Suicide Machine: Discrimination Against Federally Sentenced Indigenous Women in Canada" in *Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts*. 2. 1, 89-119.
- McGregor, Sue. (2003). "Critical Discourse Analysis: A Primer" in *Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM*. 15. 1, 1-10.
- Mercy for Animals. "Skinned Alive: Cruel Catfish Slaughter Exposed."  
<http://www.mercyforanimals.org/fish/fish-feel-pain.aspx>
- Meyer, Carter. Jones and Diana Royer. *Selling the Indian: Commercializing and Appropriating American Indian Cultures*. Eds. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2001.
- Miller, Holly. *Reconceptualizing the Wilderness Native American Landscape and Euro-American Control in America's National Parks*. 101-107.
- Musiani, Marco and Paul C. Paquet. (2004). "The Practices of Wolf Persecution, Protection, and Restoration in Canada and the United States" in *BioScience*. 54. 1, 50-60.
- Musiani, Marco, Luigi Boitani and Paul C. Paquet. *A New Era for Wolves and People: Wolf Recovery, Human Attitudes, and Policy*. Eds. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2009.
- Nash, Roderick. *Wilderness and the American Mind*. Yale University Press, 2001.
- National Post-Canadian Politics. "No Chief Complaint: Idle No More's Vague Demands Butting up against PM's Pragmatism". Jan 4, 2013, online.  
<http://news.nationalpost.com/2013/01/04/no-chief-complaint-idle-no-mores-vague-demands-butting-up-against-pms-pragmatism/>
- National Post-Posted Toronto. "Oakville Police Kill Coyote After it Jumps Fence, Bites Eight-Year-Old Girl". Jan 20, 2012, online. <http://news.nationalpost.com/2012/01/20/oakville-police-kill-coyote-after-it-jumps-fence-bites-eight-year-old-girl/>
- National Post-Posted Toronto. "The Coyote Conundrum: As Wild Animals Get Bolder, Some Question if We Can Safely Coexist." April 8, 2012, online.

<http://news.nationalpost.com/2012/04/07/the-coyote-conundrium-as-wild-animals-get-bolder-some-question-if-we-can-safely-coexist/>

Ontario Chamber of Commerce. “*OCC Rapid Policy Update: Enbridge Pipelines is Proposing to Reverse Line 9. What is the Proposal? What Does it Mean for Ontario and Communities?*”? April 30, 2013, online. <http://occ.on.ca/2013/occ-rapid-policy-update-enbridge-pipelines-is-proposing-to-reverse-line-9-what-is-the-proposal-what-does-it-mean-for-ontario-and-communities/>

Ontario Provincial Government. Ontario Ministry of Finance. *2006 CENSUS HIGHLIGHTS: Factsheet 9*, online. <http://www.fin.gov.on.ca/en/economy/demographics/census/cenhi06-9.html>

Ontario Provincial Government. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. *Strategy for Preventing and Managing Human-Wildlife Conflicts in Ontario*, 2008, print.

Ontario Provincial Government. *Living with Wildlife: Protecting Dogs from Coyotes*, print.

Pachirat, Timothy. “*Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*”. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

Pal, Leslie A. “*Beyond Policy Analysis: Public Issue Management in Turbulent Times*”. Toronto: Nelson Education Ltd., 2010. 4<sup>th</sup> edition.

Patterson, Charles. “*Eternal Treblinka: Our Treatment of Animals and the Holocaust*”. New York: Lantern Books, 2002.

Pratt, Mary Louise. “*Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*”. London: Routledge, 1992.

Preece, Rod and Lorna Chamberlain. *Animal Welfare & Human Values*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993.

Rabble.ca. “*First Nations Families Sick After Large Oil Spill in Alberta’s Peace Region*”. May 4, 2011, online. <http://rabble.ca/news/2011/05/residents-including-children-sick-after-large-oil-spill-albertas-peace-region>

Razack, Sherene H. *Race, Space, and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society*. Ed. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2002.

Razack, Sherene H. *Dark Threats and White Knights: The Somalia Affair, Peacekeeping, and the New Imperialism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.

Ray, Arthur J. *The Canadian Fur Trade in the Industrial Age*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

- Regan, Tom. *Defending Animal Rights*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001.
- Regan, Tom. *Empty Cages: Facing the Challenge of Animal Rights*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publisher, Inc, 2004.
- Robinson, Michael J. *Predatory Bureaucracy: the Extermination of Wolves and the Transformation of the West*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2005.
- Rocky Mountain Outlook. "Wolf Bounties Concerns Wildlife Groups". May 2, 2013, online. <http://www.rmoutlook.com/article/20130502/RMO0801/305029994/-1/rmo0801/wolf-bounties-concern-wildlife-groups>
- Rose, Gillian. *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to Researching With Visual Materials*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Inc., 2012. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition.
- Schlosser, Eric. *Fast Food Nation: The Dark Side of the All-American Meal*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2002.
- Shenton, A. K. (2004). "Strategies for Ensuring Trustworthiness in qualitative research projects" in *Education for Information*. 22, 63-75.
- Sinclair, Upton. *The Jungle*. London: Penguin Books Ltd, 2006.
- Smandych, Russell, Robyn Lincoln and Paul Wilson. (1993). "Toward a Cross-Cultural Theory of Indigenous Crime: a Comparative Study of the Problem of Indigenous Overrepresentation in the Criminal Justice Systems of Canada and Australia" in *International Criminal Justice Review*. 3, 1-24.
- Soja, E. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. New York: Verso, 1989.
- Sorenson, John. *About Canada: Animal Rights*. Black Point: Fernwood Publishing, 2010.
- Spence, Mark David. *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Stebra, Jim. *Nature Wars: The Incredible Story of How Wildlife Comebacks Turned Backyards into Battlegrounds*. New York: Crown Publishers, 2012.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. 2002. Racial Histories and their Regimes of Truth in *Race Critical Theories: Text and Context*. Ed. Philomena Essed and David Theo Goldberg. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Tar Sands Blockade: *Stop Keystone XL Pipeline*. "On Line 9: Solidarity with Indigenous Resistance". April 4, 2013, online. <http://www.tarsandsblockade.org/line-9/>

- Theberge, John B. and Mary T Theberge. 2004. *The Wolves of Algonquin Park: A 12 Year Ecological Study*. Number 56. University of Waterloo.
- The Association for the Protection of Fur-Bearing Animals. *The Wild & Free Press: Feeding Wildlife: More Harm Than Good? Victory! Pender Harbour Beavers Saved*. Issue 149, Jul 2012, print.
- The Association for the Protection of Fur-Bearing Animals. *The Wild & Free Press: Tails and Trails Saves Lives We're Moving*. Issue 150, Sept 2012, print.
- The Association for the Protection of Fur-Bearing Animals. "Coyotes". Accessed November 2013, online. <http://www.furbearerdefenders.com/campaigns/living-with-wildlife/coyotes>
- The Friends of Algonquin Park (Ontario Parks). *Algonquin Logging Museum: Logging History in Algonquin Provincial Park*. Queen's Printed for Ontario, 2008, print.
- The Friends of Algonquin Park (Ontario Parks). *Algonquin Information Guide Spring 2012 to Winter 2013*, print.
- The Friends of Algonquin Park (Ontario Parks). *Booth's Rock Trail: Man and the Algonquin Environment*, print.
- The Friends of Algonquin Park (Ontario Parks). *Mammals of Algonquin Provincial Park* (2002). 7<sup>th</sup> ed. 2002, print.
- The Friends of Algonquin Park (Ontario Parks). *Wolf Howling in Algonquin Provincial Park 2004: Algonquin Park Technical Bulletin No. 3*. 2004, print.
- The Globe and Mail. "All the Facts Support Keystone Pipeline, Harper Tells U.S. Audience". May 16, 2013, online. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/all-the-facts-support-keystone-pipeline-harper-tells-us-audience/article11968590/>
- Theobserver.ca. "Enbridge Wants to Reverse Sarnia Pipeline". January 29, 2011, online. <http://www.theobserver.ca/2011/01/28/enbridge-wants-to-reverse-sarnia-pipeline>
- Thespec.com. "Police Shoot Bear in Burlington Park". May 17, 2012, online. <http://www.thespec.com/news-story/2147261-police-shoot-bear-in-burlington-park-/>
- Thestar.com GTA. "Coyote Shooting in Cabbagetown was Unnecessary, experts say". Feb 12, 2013, online. [http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2013/02/12/coyote\\_shooting\\_in\\_cabbagetown\\_was\\_unnecessary\\_experts\\_say.html](http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2013/02/12/coyote_shooting_in_cabbagetown_was_unnecessary_experts_say.html)
- Thestar.com GTA. "Police Cite Public Safety in Cabbagetown Coyote Shooting". Feb 12, 2013, online.

- [http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2013/02/12/cabbagetown\\_coyote\\_shot\\_dead\\_by\\_police.html](http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2013/02/12/cabbagetown_coyote_shot_dead_by_police.html)
- Thorpe, Jocelyn. 2012. *Temagami's Tangled Wild: Race, Gender, and the Making of Canadian Nature*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Torgovnick, Mariana. *Gone Primitive: Savage Intellects, Modern Lives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Toronto Wildlife Center. Accessed November 2013, online.  
[http://www.torontowildlifecentre.com/pages/about/about\\_us.html](http://www.torontowildlifecentre.com/pages/about/about_us.html)
- Torres, Bob. *Making a Killing: The Political Economy of Animal Rights*. Oakland: AK Press, 2007.
- Town of Churchill. <http://www.churchill.ca/about/faq>
- Urry, John. *The Tourist Gaze*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc, 2002.
- Valverde, Mariana. *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water: Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885-1925*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 2008.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (1993). "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis" in *Discourse & Society*. 4. 2, 249-283.
- Wakeham, Pauline. *Taxidermic Signs: Reconstructing Aboriginality*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.
- Wall, Sharon. (2005). "Totem Poles, Teepees, and Token Traditions: 'Playing Indian' at Ontario Summer Camps, 1920-1955" in *The Canadian Historical Review*. 86. 3, 513-544.
- Whatmore, Sarah and Lorraine Thorne. (1998). "Wild(er)ness: Reconfiguring the Geographies of Wildlife" in *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*. 23, 435-454.
- Williams, Christopher K., Goran Ericsson and Thomas A. Heberlein. (2002). "A Quantitative Summary of Attitudes Towards Wolves and Their Reintroduction (1972-2000)" in *Wildlife Society Bulletin*. 30. 2, XX-XX.
- Wilson, Matthew A. And Thomas A. Heberlein. (1996). "The Wolf, the Tourist, and the Recreational Context: New Opportunity or Uncommon Circumstance?" in *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*. 1.4, 38-53.
- Wise, Tim. *Between Barack and a Hard Place: Racism and White Denial in the Age of Obama*. San Francisco: City Lights Books/Open Media Series, 2009.
- Wolch, Jennifer. (2002). "Anima Urbis" in *Progress in Human Geography*. 26. 6, 721-742.

Wolch, Jennifer and Jody Emel. *Animal Geographies: Place, Politics, and Identity in the Nature-Culture Borderlands*. Eds. London: Verso, 1998.

Wolfer, Loreen. “*Real Research: Conducting and Evaluating Research in the Social Sciences*”. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc, 2007.

Zimmermann, Barbara, Petter Wabakken and Michael Dotterer. (2001). Human-Carnivore Interactions in Norway: How Does the Re-Appearance of Large Carnivores Affect People’s Attitudes and Levels of Fear? in *For. Snow Landsc. Res.* 76. ½, 137-153.

## Photograph Appendix:

### Algonquin Provincial Park and Bruce Peninsula National Park

Figure 1: Beef Jerky Food Snack (Algonquin: Portage Shop)



Figure 2: Camp Fork (Algonquin: Portage Shop)



Figure 3: Canadianness and Bacon (Algonquin: Restaurant on Canoe Lake)



Figure 4: Canoe Experience (Algonquin: Gift Shop)





Figure 5: 'Wilderness' Pepsi Machine (Algonquin: Logging Museum)



Figure 6: Loggers Progress (Algonquin: Logging Museum)



Figure 7: Cartoon Black Bear Welcome Sign (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 8: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop



Figure 9: Waving Bear (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 10: Dancing Bear (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 11: Angel Bear (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 12: Bears Wearing Clothing (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)





Figure 13: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop



Figure 14: Wilderness Ornament Bear (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 15: Bears Canoeing (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 16: Algonquin: Gift Shop



Figure 17: Bear and Moose Canoeing (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 18: Algonquin: Gift Shop





Figure 19: Canada Bear (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 20: Don't Feed the Bears (Algonquin: Gift Shop)





Figure 21: Real Bear Magnets (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 22: Real Bear Postcard (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 23: Bear Head Skin (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 24: Canadian Fast Food (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 25: Avoiding Bear Attacks (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 26: Humans Taste Like Chicken (Algonquin: Gift Shop)





Figure 27: Wolves as 'Wilderness' (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 28: Algonquin: Gift Shop



Figure 29: Algonquin: Gift Shop



Figure 30: Algonquin: Gift Shop



Figure 31: Algonquin: Gift Shop



Figure 32: Algonquin: Gift Shop





Figure 33: Algonquin: Gift Shop



Figure 34: Solo Wolf in the Woods (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 35: Celebration of Wolves (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 36: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop





Figure 37: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop



Figure 38: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop



Figure 39: Wolf as Respectable Animal (Bruce Peninsula: Indigenous Gift Shop)



Figure 40: Coyote Pelt (Bruce Peninsula: Indigenous Gift Shop)



Figure 41: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop



Figure 42: Wine Stoppers (Algonquin: Gift Shop)





Figure 43: Coffee Mugs (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 44: Bottle-Openers (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 45: Wildlife Nightlights (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 46: Music of Wildlife (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 47: Travel Mug (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 48: Moose Droppings (Algonquin: Gift Shop)





Figure 49: Canada Stuffed Moose (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 50: Moose Coaster (Algonquin: Gift Shops)



Figure 51: Canada's Moose Wanted (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 52: Moose Dropping (Algonquin: Gift Shop)





Figure 53: Cartoon Canadian Wildlife (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 54: Maple Syrup (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 55: Algonquin: Logging Museum



Figure 56: Real Maple (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 57: Postcards of Wildlife and Canadian Identity (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 58: Canada Water Bottles (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 59: Key Chains of Canadian Symbolism (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 60: Canoe Dip Pot (Algonquin: Gift Shop)





Figure 61: Canoe T-Shirts (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 62: Algonquin Gift Shop



Figure 63: Inukshuk (Algonquin: Art Museum)



Figure 64: Algonquin: Art Museum



Figure 65: Algonquin: Art Museum



Figure 66: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop



Figure 67: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop



Figure 68: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop





Figure 69: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop



Figure 70: Healing Stones (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 71: Tribal Bracelets (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 72: Algonquin: Gift Shop



Figure 73: Spirit Bracelet (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 74: Medicine Stones (Algonquin: Gift Shop)





Figure 75: Totem Stones (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 76: Miniature Ceremonial Drums (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 77: Totem Zipper Pulls (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 78: Dream Catchers (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 79: Ceremonial Masks (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 80: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop





Figure 81: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop



Figure 82: Feather Earrings (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 83: Feather Hair Extensions (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 84: Fashionable Bracelets (Algonquin: Gift Shop)





Figure 85: Indigenous People as Mannequins (Bruce Peninsula: Indigenous Gift Shop)



Figure 86: Bruce Peninsula: Indigenous Gift Shop



Figure 87: Bruce Peninsula: Indigenous Gift Shop



Figure 88: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop



Figure 89: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop



Figure 90: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop





Figure 91: Nobel Warrior ‘Savage’ (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 92: Indigenous Gift Shop-Wooden Shed (Bruce Peninsula)



Figure 93: Authentically Indigenous and Canadian (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 94: Animal Furs as Commodity Fashions (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 95: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop



Figure 96: Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop



Figure 97: Moose and Teepee (Bruce Peninsula: Indigenous Gift Shop)



Figure 98: Indigenous People, Fur and Teepee (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)





Figure 99: Female Indigenous Hunter (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)



Figure 100: Indigenous Female with Wolves (Bruce Peninsula: Gift Shop)





Figure 101: Moccasin Stand Story (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 102: Canada Goose Jacket (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 103: Canada Goose Fur Policy Video of Indigenous ‘Support’  
(<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vzqx60NERhw>)



Figure 104: Moccasins (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 105: Natural Taxidermic Environment (Algonquin: Visitor Center)



Figure 106: Wolf Exhibit (Algonquin: Visitor Center)





Figure 107: Imaginary 'Indian' Exhibit (Algonquin: Visitor Center)



Figure 108: Warrior Hunter (Algonquin: Visitor Center)



Figure 109: Indigenous Woman Performing Gendered Practices of Beauty (Algonquin: Visitor Center)



Figure 110: Indigenous Elder (Algonquin: Visitor Center)



Figure 111: Primitive Living (Algonquin: Gift Shop)



Figure 112: Cabbagetown Coyote (Toronto Star Website)

